Drama / নাটক

Andhra University Series No. 57

KALIDASA

BY

Dr. C. KUNHAN RAJA

Professor of Sanskrit, Andhra University.

ANDHRA UNIVERSITY
WALTAIR
1956.

3/1/'76

KALIDASA: A CULTURAL STUDY

Bharatiya Vidya Bhawan's Sri Sankaracharya Sanskrit Mahavidyalaya *
631

Price: Rs. 3-0-0

Bhawan's Sri Sankara [illegible] Mahavid [illegible]
637

CONTENTS

PREFACE

I INTRODUCTORY 1

II KINGS 24

III THE COMMON PEOPLE AND WOMEN 47

IV IDEAL OF BEAUTY 65

V ART 82

VI NATURE 104

VII HEAVEN AND EARTH 124

VIII RENUNCIATION AND RELEASE 141

IX HARMONY 165

X OUR INDIA 180

NOTES 189

1509

PREFACE

I started the study of Sanskrit with the *Raghuvaṁsa* after some preliminary preparation in the elements of grammar, when I was a boy of six, fifty five years ago. From that time onwards the works of Kalidasa had been my constant companions in life. I always carried a set of his works with me whenever I went out, and they were always on my study-table in my home. I know the text bye-heart, and yet I read through the texts again and again, and I read it aloud so that I can realise the harmony between the sound and the sense in his poetry.

The more I read the works of Kalidasa, the more becomes the material in it that calls for serious study and examination. Various problems in Kalidasa study like correct readings of passages, authenticity of texts or parts of texts or individual passages in the texts, grammar and interpretation, Kalidasa's Art, various cultural points relating to the works of Kalidasa, and the date of Kalidasa, have been engaging my attention during the long period when I started on a critical study of the great poet, especially during the last twenty five years.

In most of such problems I hold views that are in conflict with the traditional views about Kalidasa, both modern and ancient. I do not accept the interpretations put on many of the passages in Kalidasa by ancient commentators. I have introduced some of such passages of doubtful interpretation in my articles and as short notes in some of the journals in English and Sanskrit. Some of them will be found in the Notes that follow in this book. Various opinions have been expressed by scholars relating to the date of Kalidasa: I am definite about Kalidasa being a contemporary of Agnimitra of the Sunga Dynasty, who is the hero in the *Mālavikāgnimitra*, a friend and colleague of the king who was both a great warrior and a great literary man. The majority of scholars assign him to the age of the Guptas, and a few accept the date of the Vikramaditya of the Vikrama Era, i. e., 56 B. C., as the date of Kalidasa. There are only few who take his date as the second century B. C. I am also definite that Kalidasa did not write beyond the first eight Cantos of the *Raghuvaṁsa* where the story ends; it is also my view that Kalidasa meant to continue the other epic beyond the available eight Cantos. As for his philosophy of life, he was not at all an advocate of *Saṁnyāsa*, he was not anti-worldly. He was advocating a full life and an active life as the noblest form of life for man.

I have tried to show some of these matters in this book. I have cited passages from the book and I have given the references in the Notes. When I render the passages in English, it is more to bring out the point than to give an accurate translation, and as such some of the passages are rendered in different wordings when they appear in different portions of the book. The facts are all taken from the works of Kalidasa; I have also shown the methods of my deduction, how I arrive at the conclusions. There is ample room for a difference of opinion on the point whether the conclusions follow from the premises. There would have been no meaning in my publishing the book if there had been no such differences of opinion on the points.

Perhaps my interpretation of other points like Kings and Common People and Women, Nature, Beauty, Art etc. may not be so controversial. I have already published a large number of articles on the various problems and I have also spoken about them in various meetings. I have prepared many Notes relating to the points which I considered important when I read the books. During 1953 and 54 when I was Professor of Sanskrit in the Tehran University in Iran, I contributed a few articles to a Weekly in Delhi, bearing Titles more or less what they are in the different chapters of this book. They were very brief. Some of them had been reproduced by other journals also. I had been wanting to collect some of my articles and publish them in book form.

It was in the last Quarter of 1954 that I joined the Andhra University as Professor of Sanskrit, and it was suggested to me that I may deliver some general lectures bearing on Indian Culture. In the second Term of 1954–55 (September—December) I took up the Culture of the Vedas for the first course of lectures and in the third Term (January—March) I took up Kalidasa as the subject. During the four and half years that I spent at Tehran, after I retired from the Madras University, I had no facilities to devote my time for any serious studies, and this new position in an Indian University gave me a chance once more to take up such a serious study and to make use of the mass of Notes that had been accumulating in my boxes when I left Madras. I utilised such Notes in preparing the two courses of lectures, and the Andhra University kindly sanctioned their publication. The lectures on the Vedas and the lectures on Kalidasa were both made ready for publication. But I decided to get the lecture on Kalidasa printed first. The other will go to the press now. I am publishing the lectures in the form in which they were prepared for the lectures. But owing to the shortness of time, all the lectures could not be actually delivered. Only some of them, and that in the form of selections of portions, were actually delivered as lectures.

The lectures were not meant for specialists. The audience that I had to address consisted of students and teachers of the University, people with education and culture and with interest in the subject. It is a matter of great satisfaction and even pride for me that some of the Professors and other teachers and many students had been regularly attending the lectures. That was a great encouragement for me. I have added the Notes later, instead of introducing them in the body of the book since they would have been of no use for the people for whom the lectures were meant. But there are others who desire to go deeper into the matter, and the Notes are meant for them. I have to presume that those who read the book know the outline of the works of Kalidasa; without such a preliminary preparation, it is not possible for any one to follow the treatment of the subject, and it is not possible for me to explain all such matters in the book itself. There are some translations of the works of Kalidasa; I have given some outline of the works in this book also.

There are still many points that require treatment. I hope to do so on some future occation. Many of the subjects can be understood only by persons who have a closer acquaintance with the works of Kalidasa. If I begin to treat of the date of Kalidasa or the artistic symmetry in working out the plot of the dramas or the problem of "Time Duration" in the dramas or the supernatural element or the private and the public side of the chief characters, I have to enter into details which only a close student of Kalidasa can understand. In this course of lectures I have introduced only such matters that could be treated without entering into much of details. Even then I have practically covered the entire text, as the Notes will show.

When I was preparing these lectures, I did not have the copies of many of the articles that I had published about Kalidasa. I had the works of Kalidasa and also the Notes which I had been writing out relating to many points about Kalidasa. This is not a collection of such articles; this is not even an enlargement of such articles. They are all originally written out in the form of lectures. I did not re-write the lectures for publication. That explains why there are many places where points are repeated. In a lecture I have to mention such points again in a particular context, though they had been mentioned on previous occasions I know that in a book, they could be omitted, with just a reference to the previous contexts. But I prefer to publish the book in the form in which it was originally written out as lectures.

I take this opportunity to thank the Teachers and the students of the University for their presence at the lectures and for their encouragement. Their appreciation was a source of great inspiration for me, and their occasional questions enabled me to re-think of some of the points and to make my mind clearer. Perhaps my replies did not satisfy the questioners in many cases. What I value is their appreciation and not so much their approval.

Dr. V. S. Krishna, the scholar Vice-chancellor of the Andhra University had been always taking a keen interest in Sanskrit and in my work. I owe him sincere gratitude for entertaining me in the University, thus giving me a chance to revive my studies, temporarily broken after I left the Madras University. I am specially thankful to him for arranging the publications of the lectures in book form. Shri K. V. Gopalaswamy, the Registrar was equally kind to me and without his sincere co-operation, the book would not have been published so soon. He too took a personal interest in the work and has done many things by way of encouragement for me in my work.

The lectures were ready in book form for publication in July 1955, and arrangements for publication were also complete within a short time. But I had to surmount some difficulties regarding the right types. This work is meant for the general reader; yet when I have to treat a subject like this in English, some technical points cannot be excluded. Printing could actually start only by the end of the year. In printing I have written the proper names with popular spelling, since many of the names are familiar to the general reader. In the case of the names of authors, I have printed the whole name in Capitals. Names of works and Sanskrit words are written with phonetic spelling, using diacritical marks and are put in Italics. I have given the English equivalents for the Sanskrit words.

References have been made to other works. My lectures on the Vedas will appear in book form soon. I am preparing a course of lectures on "Landmarks in Literary Critcisim" in which I will explain some of the points on which I hold views different from what is ordinarily held, the chief of them being the meaning of *Sthāyi-Bhāva* (the Enduring Pathos, which is identified with *Rasā* or Emotion) and the nature of dramas in which *Sṛṅgāra* and *Vīra* (Love and Heroism) are the dominating Emotions. Many of the points that I raise in the lectures on the Vedas can become clear only with the help of another series of lectures on "Buddha as the Founder of Modern Indian Religion," which is getting ready. I have also to give an outline of Latter-day Indian Philosophy to make some other points in the lectures on the Vedas clear. Many points dealt with in this book also may stand in need of help from the book relating to Indian philosophy. The Back-ground of Classical

Sanskrit Literature is another subject a treatment of which is necessary to make the picture complete. A comprehensive presentation of the *Mahābhārata* and the *Rāmāyaṇa* as the true representatives of the genius of India is another matter that has long been overdue. They are all in preparation and will appear in due course.

It has been my ambition, and also an eager dream, to prepare a complete account of Indian civilization from the very beginning, basing such treatment on the literature of India instead of emphasising the evidences supplied in foreign accounts and foreign comments, both old and new. Plans are ready for such a serial publication of books on a uniform basis; talents are available in plenty; there are sufficient number of devoted workers. But such an undertaking requires business organisation and financial assistance. And there is no Raghu now, of whom I have said something on Pp. 38 and 40 of this book. I have placed the plan before many persons who could be of help. None of them seemed to have heard of the great patron of learning in the person of Raghu in ancient times.

I have again and again made references to the Vedas and to the *Mahābhārata* and the *Rāmāyaṇa* in the course of these lectures, and I have also made references to some religious tendencies and foreign influences in the lectures. The references are quite clear. I cannot substantiate my points unless I have the facility to explain my position in a few volumes. I must here state categorically that I have nothing but adoration to offer to the Great Lord Buddha, and I consider Him and worship Him as one of the mighty pillars that support Indian civilization, along with Shri Krishna and Veda Vyasa. But I cannot say that my attitude is the same towards some beliefs and customs and institutions that have been associated with His Sacred Name. I await the advent of a modern Raghu for realising my ambition of writing such a series of books, for which everything except money and business organisation, is ready. I am issuing these few books on the subjects as a preparation for the larger venture, to pave the way for it, to show that there is a fresh approach possible, to indicate some blanks in the available presentations, and even some distortions in them.

In spite of all the attention that I bestowed, some errors have crept into the printing in this book. Most of them are of a simple nature, in the matter of spelling and punctuation, and as such I have not added a correction list. But some mistakes in indicating the Note numbers in the text are of a serious nature and I give below the cases where such mistakes have crept in.

Kings:– No. 39; Common People and Women – Nos. 1 and 39 (on P. 59); Ideal of Beauty – Nos, 18 (entered as 19 on P. 69), 30 and 43; Art – Nos. 2, 9, 17, 39, 45 and 61 to 63; Nature – Nos. 21 and 29; Heaven and Earth – No. 56; Renunciation and Release – No. 37; Harmony – No. 3.

Most of the corrections are shown in the respective Notes.

I take this opportunity to thank the Sri Ranga Printing Press of Visakhapatnam for finishing the printing of the book in this way.

Andhra University
Waltair
4th July, 1956.

C, KUNHAN RAJA.

KALIDASA

INTRODUCTORY.

KALIDASA has been recognised as the greatest poet of India. We do not know when he flourished. But ever since there began to appear some reference to him, there has been a continuous appreciatiou of his contributions to Sanskrit Literature in its various forms of Epic, Drama and short poem with a lyric touch. No poet after his time has excelled him, and one can see attempts in the literary contributions of later poets to approach his standards. He really set the standard for dramatic excellence and epic form, and also for lyrical beauty. Even in modern times when Sanskrit became known to the West, KALIDASA's drama the *Śākuntala* was among the earliest to attract the attention of literary luminaries there, and they all have bestowed praises on his poetic genius in a lavish way.

Although Sir William Jones is not the first European to learn Sanskrit, his name is associated with the beginnings of an extensive study of the literature. He translated the *Śākuntala* into English[1] and it was translated into German.[2] It was this translation of a translation that caught the eyes of the great German poet Goethe who wrote about it as follows:

> Wouldst thou the youg year's blossoms, wouldst thou the fruits of the later year
> Wouldst thou what charms and enraptures, wouldst thou what feasts and nourishes,
> Wouldst thou the heaven and the earth with one word comprehend ?
> I name thee *Śākuntala* and then has all been said.

This appreciation of the great German poet has become a classic in the field of Sanskritic criticism, and there are few books on the subject in which it is not cited or at least referred to, either in its original form or in translation. It is receiving such a great popularity not because it comes from a poet of the West but because it comes from one of the greatest of the poets of the world and that after seeing only the translation of a very indifferent translation of the original. So have many a literary man of the

West at that early time in the history af the study of Sanskrit in the West and also in modern times. Prof. A. W. Ryder from America has translated the works of KALIDASA into English[3] and he has also added a very appreciative note about KALIDASA in all its aspects. This is perhaps the best appreciation of the works of KALIDASA in modern times. It is worthwhile to read the whole note from his pen.

In ancient times, BANA, a great prose writer, the author of the magnificent Romance named the *Kādambarī* and of the historical Romance named the *Harṣacarita*, the story of King Harsha of Kanouj whose contemporary be was, has said in the introductory portion of his *Harṣacarita* about KALIDASA as follows:

> In whom does not arise full enjoyment when there flows the poems of KALIDASA saturated in sweetness, as in the case of a bunch of flowers ?

It has been said in another popular verse;

> When there arose an occasion to count the poets in ancient times, KALIDASA took his position on the little finger; even now since there has not appeared an equal, the name "devoid of a name" become literally true (for the little finger).

There are various other references to KALIDASA in Sanskrit Literature.

ANANDAVARDHANA, one of the greatest among the literary critics in Sanskrit, and perhaps in the whole world, speaks of KALIDASA as one among the five or six real poets and counts him along with VEDAVYASA the author of the *Mahābhārata* and VALMIKI the author of the *Rāmāyaṇa*.[4] Thus, to him KALIDASA and VEDAVYASA and VALMIKI form a trio in Sanskrit literature, being the greatest of the poets known to him. His important theories are based on the poetry of these three great poets.

In spite of such continuous and consistent reputation which KALIDASA enjoyed as a great poet both in India and outside, he is the least known poet of the world. Practically nothing is known of him. He himself mentions his name as KALIDASA only in his Dramas, where, as is the practice in Sanskrit Dramas, the author's name and the name of the Drama are mentioned in the prologue. We can safely say that the three Dramas are written by the same person whose name is given as KALIDASA in them. It is only tradition that helps us in assigning the two long Epics and a short lyrical poem to him. There are various commentaries on his works; but not a single commentator gives any information about the poet.

A large number of works, bad and indifferent, but not one that can be called a good piece, have been fathered on him. But tradition assigns only the two Epics and the lyrical poem to him; and there is one more Lyric that is now accepted as the work of KALIDASA. The two long Epics written by him are the *Raghuvaṁśa* and the *Kumārasambhava*. The lyrical poem is the *Meghadūta*. The other lyrical poem assigned to him in modern times is the *Ṛtusaṃhāra*. The three dramas, the *Mālavikāgnimitra*, the *Vikramorvaśīya* and the *Śākuntala* are mentioned as the works of KALIDASA in the dramas themselves. From the point of view of literary criticism also, we are not wrong in identifying the KALIDASA who wrote the three Dramas with the author of the two Epics and the lyrical poem.

The *Raghuvaṁśa*, one of the Epics, deals with the kings of the Solar Dynasty, beginning with Raghu who started a new Dynasty with his name. Of course the father of Raghu has also to be dealt with, for starting the poem in the natural way. Then Raghu and his son Aja are dealt with in the first eight Cantos. Aja's son Dasaratha who is the father of Shri Rama comes next in the nineth Canto. Cantos ten to fifteen deal with the story of Shri Rama, closely following the *Rāmāyaṇa* of VALMIKI. The sixteenth and the seventeenth Cantos deal with Shri Rama's son Kusa and his son Atithi. In the eighteenth Canto a large number of kings are dealt with giving a pen picture of each in two or three verses. The ninteenth Canto deals with king Agnivarna, who led a very objectionable life, indulging in his harem, indifferent to the welfare of the people and disregarding his ministers and even the people at large. He died and his queen, who was expecting a child, sat on the throne and ruled the kingdom with efficiency and justice; in this unnatural context the poem ends.

The other Epic, the *Kumārasambhava*, deals with the marriage of the great God Siva with Parvati the daughter of the mountain Himavan. The birth and childhood of Parvati the penance of Siva in the mountain Himavan after he lost his consort (Canto 1), the oppression of the gods by a great demon named Taraka, the prayer of the gods to Brahma for protection, and the reply of Brahma that he himself cannot kill the demon for some technical reasons but that if Siva who was undergoing a penance, could be persuaded to marry the daughter of the mountain Himavan, the son born of the union would be able to kill their enemy (Canto 2), the attempt of the gods to move the heart of Siva through the power of Kama, the Lord of Love, the death of Kama being burnt in the fire from the eyes of Siva (Canto 3), the wailing of his wife Rati (Canto 4), the penance of Parvati because she lost the chance of winning the love of Siva, the appearance of Siva before her incognito being pleased with her devotion and the promise that he would marry her (Canto 5), the message of Siva to the mountain asking the hands of his daughter, sent through the seven great sages (Canto 6) and the wedding of Siva with Parvati (Canto 7) and their honeymoon described in great detail (Canto 8) are contained in the first eight Cantos. The poem written by KALIDASA ends here. But the end is quite unnatural; the eighth Canto ends like this:

> For full one hundred years, Siva, attached to the pleasures in the company of his newly wedded wife, enjoyed life as if it were just a single night, and yet his desires for further enjoyments were not broken off.

This is not the way in which a poem can be concluded. We do not know what theme KALIDASA wanted to deal with in the poem. It is now known as *Kumārasambhava*, the birth of Kumara (the War-god.) In the other Epic he says that he was writing on the dynasty of Raghu.[5] Here, since there is frequent mention of the birth of a son who would kill the demon, it may be concluded that what he wanted to write about is not merely the wedding of Siva but the birth of a son and the exploits of that son. Further, the poem is not properly concluded in the available portion of the text. A later poet[6] and a far inferior one too, added a few more Cantos to bring the story to the natural conclusion. Some people have tried to show that KALIDASA wanted to write only the eight Cantos and that the poem is known as *Kumārasambhava* in so far as it deals with *Sambhava* or Union, prior to the Kumara or the birth of the Kumara. But the unnatural way in which the eighth Canto ends is clear proof that KALIDASA wanted to continue the poem, and the descriptions in the first eight Cantos show also that the poem was meant to continue much further than the eight Cantos, if the mind of the reader is to be left without any further expectancy. This point will be taken up in a later lecture.

What a poet has in his mind, events and characters that had a special appeal to him, are reflected not only in the earlier portion of his poem, but also in his other poems written prior to the composition of a particular piece. In the *Raghuvaṁsá* also we find frequent references to Kumara and what has appealed to KALIDASA, as found in these references is not the wedding of Siva with Parvati, but the birth of the son and his exploits. All theses evidences prove that the Epic *Kumārasambhava* was meant to be continued beyond the eight Cantos now available. We do not know why he did not finish his work. There is a story that Parvati was annoyed with such detailed descriptions of the honey-moon and cursed KALIDASA that he would lose his poetic talent.

The lyric poem called the *Meghadūta* is unique in the literature of the world. This is a type initiated by KALIDASA and imitated by many other poets in Sanskrit and even in modern Indian languages. There is no other language, so far as I know, in which there is such a type. Here the poem is divided into two parts each of about fifty or sixty verses. But the whole poem is what may be called a short lyric, as distinct from the long epics. A lover far removed from his beloved by circumstances, sends a message of solace to his beloved through some agent; the first part contains mainly a description of the route to be followed to reach the home of the beloved and the second part contains a description of the city where the beloved lives, the house of the beloved, the condition of the beloved in the state of separation as imagined by the hero, the message of solace and some secret mark for identifying the messenger and for an assurance that the message is genuine, and this mark is generally in the form of a reference to some incident which none but the hero and the heroine could have known. This is the plan which KALIDASA started and the imitations have mostly followed this technique. The metre used by KALIDASA is also a special one, called the *Mandākrāntā,* i. e. verses of four lines of seventeen syllabes divided into three parts of four, six and seven syllables each. The actual scheme is :

— — — — / ◡ ◡ ◡ ◡ ◡ — / — ◡ — — ◡ — —

Some imitators have made the message to emanate from the heroine. In a few cases it is a seeker of truth, some devotee, sending a message to the Supreme or to the Deity.

In the poem of KALIDASA, a Yaksha some demi-god, employed in a very high office by their king at their Capital, Alaka in the

Himalayas, became very proud of his position and forgot himself to such an extent that the king became angry and banished him for a year. He took his abode in a mountain in the South where Sita during her life in the forest used to live and bathe in the pools near by and where Rama too used to wander about making the whole mountain side holy. The rainy season came and the hero became very anxious about the life of his beloved left behind at Alaka and decided to send a message of solace through the cloud that was seen moving to the North. First he accosts him and tells him about his own condition ; then he requests him to go to Alaka for delivering a message to his beloved. He starts describing the route, where there were mountains and rivers, where the animals and birds would be his occasional companions. A city is mentioned, called Vidisa,[7] and another City, Ujjayini[8] is described in great detail. North of that a temple is also mentioned. Then we see nothing to the north of this place. Gradually the cloud is to reach the foot of the Himalayas and then the first part ends. In the second half, there is a beautiful description of Alaka, a place of Utopian happiness, and then follows the description of the house where he used to live and where his beloved was still living and then the condition of the beloved, as imagined by himself in the state of separation. Then he asks his beloved to have courage during the four further months yet to go and promises her again a life of happiness after his return at the end of the period of banishment. This closes the poem.

This gives the poet plenty of occasion to describe the objects of Nature like the mountains and the rivers and the birds and the animals and the common people, especially the village damsels. He describes the mountains as the friends of the cloud and the rivers as his beloved. The glances of the village damsels without training in exhibiting their love through such methods are specially mentioned.

Of the three Dramas, one relates to a historical character, King Agnimitra, son of Pushyamitra who put an end to the last of the Mouryan kings and made himself the ruler ; Pushyamitra was his Commander-in-chief and even after ascending the throne, he refers to himself only as a Commander-in-chief (*Senāpati*). In a letter sent to his son Agnimitra, there is a hint that perhaps it was Agnimitra who was the king. But it was Pushyamitra who performs the ***Asvamedha*** Sacrifice, usually performed only by ruling kings. Here there is an intertwining of a historical event with some domestic events.

In the country of Vidarbha adjacent to the place where Agnimitra had been camping (perhaps it was his temporary Capital) during his southern campaigns, called Vidisa, there was a succession dispute between two cousins, and Agnimitra had promised to help one of them named Madhavasena, whose sister Malavika he had arranged to marry. This Madhavasena with his sister was proceeding to Vidisa on a courtesy visit before the marriage. But the Commander-in-chief of his rival waylaid the party and took Madhavasena prisoner. The sister could not be found after the turmoil. She escaped with another lady companion and reached the border where Agnimitra's brother-in-law (wife's brother) was posted to guard the kingdom and he sent her to Agnimitra's queen so that his sister could employ her as keeper of her treasures. Her lady companion joined the order of the Buddhist Nuns, on account of grief at the death of her brother in the fray and she too went to the court of Agnimitra and stayed there as a learned lady, advising the king and keeping the company of the queen. This is the political background.

Malavika lived in the court without her identity being known to anyone except to the Buddhist Nun. And the latter on her part started planning to bring the king and Malavika together. The queen guarded the newly arrived lady with great care to see that the king does not get a chance to meet her. This is the plot for the main part of the drama. In the end, the king and Malavika manage to meet and they fall in love with each other; at this time messengers arrive announcing the disappearance of Malavika and they identify the heroine. By this time the queen herself had decided to permit the marriage. The queen's brother had marched against Madhavasena's rival and defeated him. Agnimitra's son was accompanying the horse that had been let loose to wander about for a year, as is the custom before Pushyamitra could perform the *Asvamedha* Sacrifice; news arrive about his great victory over the *Yavanas* who had tried to capture the horse. Agnimitra condones the action of Madhavasena's rival and decides to divide the Vidarbha country into two parts and allow Madhavasena and his cousin to rule each part. Malavika was married to Agnimitra also. This is the political plot, and the domestic events end in happiness.

The two other dramas of his have some theme taken from the ancient Epics. They are both found in the ***Mahābhārata***, and they are also stories that could be traced to Vedic times. One is not at all certain whether KALIDASA took the theme as found in the *Mahābhārata* or from the stories current in the country in the pre-*Mahābhārata* days.

One of them deals with King Pururavas who was the great-grand-son of the Moon, and as such one of the earliest of the kings of the Lunar Dynasty, and his love with Urvasi, a celestial nymph, their marriage and their happy life together and their final separation after the birth of a son who was installed on the throne. Urvasi became the captive of a Demon named Kesin and King Pururavas who was at that time passing that way, heard her cries and went and rescued her; they fell in love with each other. But Urvasi was to take part in a drama in heaven and instead of uttering the word *Puruṣottama*, she actually uttered the name as *Purūravas* by mistake, since her mind was full of loving thought about that king. Bharata who was conducting the performance cursed her for the mistake that she would lose her divine nature and that she would have to live on earth for some time. Indra was in need of the help of that great king in his wars against the demons and so he pardoned her and permitted her to go to the earth and marry the king and live with him. But he had already a queen and there arose some difficulty about the union; yet the queen had to give in. They married. Their happiness was suddenly brought to a close through misunderstanding and jealousy, so natural among newly wedded couples, and Urvasi left the king in a fit of anger and disappeared. They were spending their days far away from their home, and the king found himself alone; he had lost his companion. In sorrow the king wandered about in the garden searching the missing damsel. But the heroine was discovered; they had a son and the limit of the period for the heroine to live with the hero was the time when he would *see* the son born of the heroine. Though concealed, the hero one day met the son by chance and the heroine had to depart for heaven. In the end Indra himself interceded and asked Urvasi to go back to him and live with him. Indra never wanted to make the king unhappy through any one related to himself, as he was always in need of the king's help in his wars with the demons.

The third drama, *Śākuntala* is the most famous among his contributions. Sakuntala was the daughter of the celestial damsel Menaka and the sage Viswamitra; the baby, as soon as she was born, was abondoned on the way and a sage named Kanva took her and brought her up as his own daughter. One day when he was away from his hermitage on a mission of some pilgrimage to a holy place to alleviate some possible misfortune in the case of his foster-daughter, in so far as she was not able to secure a suitable husband though she was coming of age, the king chanced to go there during his hunting expeditions in the forests; he was received at the hermitage by Sakuntala and her two companions. Naturally there arose love between Sakuntala and the king Dusshanta at first sight. The king gave up his hunting and he got a chance to spend some days at the hermitage. During that stay, they met and they also married through mutual consent. After that the king left the place with a promise to send a suitable escort for her to go to the palace. At that time Sakuntala was immersed in thoughts about the king who had left the hermitage and she did not notice another hermit, Durvasas who had gone there. He got irritated and cursed her that her husband would not remember her when she would go to the palace. The companions of Sakuntala alone knew of this incident and they had secured some way out of the danger in so far as the sage consented to see that the husband would remember her if some token were shown to him. Sakuntala had the king's ring and they knew that the ring would enable the king to remember Sakuntala. At that stage, Kanva, the foster-father returned from his pilgrimage and knowing about the happy marriage of his daughter with such a great king, he made preparations for Sakuntala to go to the palace of the king with proper escorts. They started and on the way they had to halt at a lake; it so happened that the ring dropped from Sakuntala's finger and she did not notice it. They all reached the palace and they were received by the king in due form; but when their mission was announced, the king could not remember what had taken place in the hermitage and he refused to accept Sakuntala as his wedded wife. Those who accompanied Sakuntala got irritated and they even accused Sakuntala of being unworthy of such a great foster-father. They would not take her back to the hermitage. The king decided to keep Sakuntala in a safe place in the palace, on the advise of the preceptor. But when she was about to be ascorted to that place, some celestial being snatched her away. It was a friend of her mother Menaka, who was always watching the life of the daughter, though she had abandoned her. She was taken to the hermitage of a great sage named Maricha, who took care of her. Sakuntala had been expecting a child and that child was born in that hermitage. He was a boy and the boy was given proper training. He was growing up into a great hero.

The king was feeling uneasy that he had to reject the lady who had come to the palace claiming to be his wife, and yet he could not remember the event. It so happened that the ring was swallowed by a fish and a fisherman brought the ring to the palace when he found it inside the fish that he caught in a lake. The king immediately remembered all the events and was full of remorse. At that time Indra sent for him to go to heaven and help him in a fight with the demons. On his way back, the king decided to go to the hermitage of the great sage Maricha and pay his respects to him, which he could not do on his onward journey. There he met Sakuntala and his son who had become a very heroic boy; he had been given the name of *Sarvadamana* (the controller of all). They all went back to the palace in great joy after this re-union and with the blessings of the great sage; the boy is known in later times as Bharata.

These are the six well-known works of KALIDASA. Many of the scholars accept that a small Lyric describing the six seasons, and known for that reason by the name of *Ṛtusaṁhāra*, is also a work of KALIDASA, But many do not accept this position. It is a very short poem in six sections, each section dealing with a particular *Ṛtu* or season.

Many poets of later times assumed the name of KALIDASA and as a matter of fact in the court of most of the great kings there had been a poet who was called KALIDASA. We do not know what the actual name of KALIDASA was. This must be his pen name. His personality is immersed in a flood of legends, which make it more difficult to know something definite about his personal life. About his name, there is a story that he was an idiot in his boyhood and that when he married, his wife used to taunt him for his stupidity. So he went to a Kali temple and sat on the front pavement before the shrine. At midnight when Kali went out for the usual hunt, he get into the shrine aad bolted the door from within. When Kali returned she could not get in and asked who was within; there came the response from within with another question who was outside, and Kali replied that it was Kali who was speaking. From within came the reply that within was the Servant of Kali (Kalidasa). He opened the door; Kali was very much pleased with him and knowing his desire, she gave him a boon that he would become a great poet. All that we can say is that he is known in literature as KALIDASA. What he was in private life we do not know and we may not know also.

We know little about the private life of most of the poets and dramatists in Sanskrit; we do not even know their actual name. BHAVABHUTI in his drama says that his designation is Srikantha. There is a reference in a philosophical work that BHAVABHUTI in the beginning was a great author in philosophy and that it was only at a later stage that he started writing dramas. There is also an identification of BHAVABHUTI with a well-known writer on *Mīmāṁsā* named UMVEKA. UMVEKA is also identified with other writers on *Mīmāṁsā* and *Vedānta*. There is much uncertainty and controversy about all such identifications.[9] There is also a story that BHAVABHUTI acquired that name from a verse which he wrote :

tapasvī kām gato 'vasthām iti smerananāviva
girijāyāḥ stanau vande bhavabhūtisitānanau

I worship the two breasts of the daughter of the mountain (i. e., Parvati), which is white in its face because of the ashes (*Bhūti*) from BHAVA (Siva) (BHAVABHUTI), and which therefore appeared to be laughing at the god: "to what a stage has this man performing penance been reduced ?" This has no more value than the story about the name KALIDASA stated above.

Neither BHARAVI (author of the *Kirātārjunīya*) nor MAGHA (author of the *Śiśupālavadha*) seems to be the real name. So is the case with BANA (the author of the two prose Romances, the *Kādambarī* and the *Harṣacarita*). The author of the drama, the *Mṛcchakaṭika*, is known as SUDRAKA. But in the prologue of the drama SUDRAKA is mentioned as the author, who had already died.

About the place of his birth and the place where he spent his life, we know nothing. There are many surmises on the point by modern scholars. In ancient times, no one worried about the personal affairs of a poet; they cared only for his poetry and his art. In the short lyric called the ***Meghadūta***, there is a detailed description of the famous city of Ujjayini and some people are of the view that he must have had a partiality for that city and probably he belonged to that place. The celebrity of the city is sufficient justification for such a detailed description and it is not necessary that a poet who described the city had any personal partiality for it. Because he describes the saffron plant in the fields, there is another view that he might have belonged to Kashmir, since the saffron plant is grown only in that region. Others say that the description of Bengal and other Eastern regions show that he belonged to Bengal. Such evidences lead us to no definite place. All that we can conclude from such evidences is that he had a very accurate knowledge of the different regions of India.

But there is one point which we cannot ignore. In describing the regions on the way to Alaka on the Himalayas, in the lyric poem, the *Meghadūta*, he starts the descriptlon from a place which must be somewhere near to Wardha, and the detailed descriptions end with

Ujjayini. After that there is a long stretch of the country before one reaches the Himalayas. Why did KALIDASA start the description from that point and why did he end also at that point? That shows some special partiality for that region. That is all that I can say about the place where he spent his life. But we know nothing about the place of his birth. I can understand why he describes the famous city of Ujjayini. But I cannot understand why he lays such a great emphasis on the city called Vidisa, the modern Bilsa, which was never a great and famous city in literature. The scene of the plot of his drama, the *Mālavikāgnimitra* is also laid in that city. In the *Meghadūta*, he speaks of the city as the world-known Imperial Capital.

Another point which a modern student of literature would be interested in is the question of the date of the great poet. Here also, we know practically nothing. Indian tradition says that he was the contemporary of king Bhoja, and we know only of one great Bhoja, who ruled over the kingdom of Dhara, and he lived in the middle of the 11th century. There are many anecdotes about KALIDASA and king Bhoja. Some are also related to other great poets known in Sanskrit literature. And they cannot by any means be contemporaries. They have a value in tracing the course of literary criticism in Sanskrit and no value at all for the history of Sanskrit literature. KALIDASA is made a contemporary of another great poet of Sanskrit, MAGHA, who has written the grand Epic called the *Śiśupālavadha*. It is said that MAGHA had read out his poem to KALIDASA in advance prior to presenting it to the Academy in the court of Bhoja. KALIDASA knew that if the poem were to be read there, his own fame would be on the vane; this new composition was such a grand one. So when he started reading the poem in the court, there was a slight jerk in the regular flow of the language even in the very first verse, and KALIDASA put his hand on his head as if to prevent anything from falling on his head through that jerk. MAGHA was very much upset that KALIDASA who had approved the poem as worthy of being presented at the court should have so let him down at the court, and he did not continue his recitation. He decided to kill KALIDASA by dropping a stone on his head while be would be returning home. KALIDASA, who had some supernatural powers through the boon of Kali, knew of his intentions, and so when he was on his way back, he started reciting some of the fine verses from that poem and nodding his head in appreciation; MAGHA who was sitting on the top of a tree on the way came down, confessed his intentions and asked for his pardon. When MAGHA asked him why he let him down at the court, he on his part also confessed his fear about his own fame being dwindled by the new poem. The next day, the poem was read out in the court.

There are similar stories about BHAVABHUTI, SANKARA KAVI etc. in which KALIDASA was introduced as the poet to decide the merits of any poem presented in the court of Bhoja. These stories simply show what the literary critics of later days thought of the relative merits of the poetry of KALIDASA and others. They are of no use in determining the date of KALIDASA.

There was a great king named Samudragupta in the middle of the fourth century and in his inscriptions, he is spoken of as the friend of poets[10] who destroyed the poverty of poets. It is presumed by some that on account of this patronage, KALIDASA may be placed at the same time. There is no valid basis for such a presumption.

Another theory is that since KALIDASA ends his poem, the *Raghuvaṁśa* rather abruptly at the death of the king Agnivarna, he might have been his contemporary and he ended the poem with the death of his contemporary king. That will put the date of KALIDASA at about the eighth century B. C, according to the list of kings found in the *Purāṇas*. (Epics).

The theory that holds the ground at present is what Sir William Jones had suggested. He accepted KALIDASA as a contemporary of a great king Vikramaditya. In an astronomical work called the *Jyotirvidābharaṇa* it is said that there were nine gems in the court of that king and KALIDASA was one of them, the astronomical work itself being mentioned in it as the work of KALIDASA. But we know that the work itself is a very late one, since that gives many later dates, and the Vikramaditya mentioned in it is no other than the king of Dhara, known as Bhoja. No two of the nine gems mentioned there can be accepted as contemporaries, and some of them are not known at all, in literature. Still all accept the tradition that KALIDASA lived in the court of a great Vikramaditya, and at present the attempt is only to identify the Vikramaditya. There is an Era current in India, called the Vikrama Era or Samvat Era. That started in 56 B. C., and so a Vikramaditya is assumed as having lived at Ujjayini at that time and KALIDASA is accepted as having been his contemporary and as a court poet. But we know of no such great king at Ujjayini in that period. Further, there are many scholars who think it too early a date for KALIDASA. Yet all accept the fact that KALIDASA lived in the court of a Vikramaditya.

There are some kings of the Gupta Dynasty who are styled as Vikramadityas, and so most of the scholars are of the view that KALIDASA was a contemporary of one or the other of the Gupta Vikramadityas. They say that the drama *Vikramorvaśīya* is so called to introduce the name of his patron into his drama.[11] They also find a predominence of words from the root *Gup*, like *Goptar* (protector) in the works of KALIDASA. In the *Raghuvaṁśa* there is a statement that Dilipa was born in the dynasty of Manu, like the moon from the ocean;[12] here they see a reference to Samudragupta (Ocean) and Chandragupta (Moon) of the Gupta dynasty. The word Kumara is very prominent in the *Raghuvaṁśa* and this is taken as indicating KALIDASA's partiality for Kumaragupta of the same dynasty.

There are thus two alternatives, either the Vikramaditya who founded the Vikrama Era in 56 B. C. or one of the Vikramadityas of the Gupta dynasty who all came without much of an interval in-between, and thus making the choice of the actual Vikramaditya of little moment. From the point of view of the number of adherents, the Gupta Dynasty theory has the majority, while from the point of view of the strength of argument, neither of the two alternatives can stand a scientific test.

References to the association of KALIDASA with a Vikramaditya are very rare. There are many tales about Vikramaditya, and in none of them is he spoken of as a great patron of literature, and the name of KALIDASA is not mentioned in any of them. If such a great poet like KALIDASA had been living in the court of Vikramaditya, it is rather strange that there is no reference to KALIDASA anywhere in the immense literature relating to Vikramaditya. The reference to the nine gems started very late and we are not at all sure of the historicity of that tradition. The assignment of the title of Vikramaditya to particular kings is also a very late one; the term Vikramaditya is found associated with some of the kings of the Gupta dynasty along with other titles and there is nothing to give a preference to the title Vikramaditya as denoting a great king with such a title. As for the dynasty of the Gupta kings assumed as alluded to in the use of the forms from root *Gup* (to protect) there is no such partiality for that word in any of the works of KALIDASA and the very word *Gupta* is not at all a favourite one in the works of KALIDASA. These words appear just as other words appear in his poems

We have to look for some more substantial points to infer the date of KALIDASA. There is an inscription, called the Aihole inscription of the early seventh century where the author who wrote out the inscription mentions KALIDASA along with another great poet BHARAVI.[13] This along with BANA, who has spoken of KALIDASA in the introductory portion to his historical Romance, the *Harṣacarita*, are the earliest references to KALIDASA, and they prove nothing. They are very late dates, and to say that KALIDASA lived before the beginning of the seventh century is no more valuable in the context than to say that he lived prior to our own times.

At the end of his drama, the *Mālavikāgnimitra*, there is the benedictory verse, technically called a *Bharatavākya*, in which the name of the hero Agnimitra, is mentioned as ruling the country at that time.[14] Usually the benedictory verse at the end of a drama expresses a prayer for plenty and freedom from calamities. It is only in one other drama that the name of the hero is mentioned and that is the *Mudrārākṣasa*, in which Chandragupta Mourya is the hero, and in the concluding benedictory verse, there is a prayer that Chandragupta may protect the country. In this drama, there is not even a hint that the hero Chandragupta is a contemporary ruler, and this is only an alternative reading. But in the *Mālavikāgnimitra*, the hero is expressly mentioned as ruling the country, and the Actor who had taken the part of the hero says that when Agnimitra rules the country there is no possibility of freedom from national calamities and other misfortunes not being found in the country, thereby hinting that such a general benedictory verse is not wanted at that stage.

This can be taken as a clear evidence that the drama was written and staged at the time when Agnimitra was ruling the country. That will take the date of KALIDASA to near the beginning or at least the middle of the second century B. C., when the Mourya Dynasty was exterminated and the Sunga dynasty was started in Magadha. Agnimitra was the son of the founder of the dynasty, Pushyamitra, who was living at the time when the incidents of the drama took place.

In this drama the scene is laid in the city called Vidisa, which is not at all a famous city in history. Yet in the *Meghadūta* where KALIDASA describes some regions between the modern Wardha and Ujjayini, the poet speaks of Vidisa[15] as the world-famous Imperial Capital. Unless KALIDASA had some special feeling of personal love for the city, there is no reason why he should have made such a mention of this rather unimportant city. The likelihood is that when Agnimitra was ruling at

Vidisa, KALIDASA too was there with him, and KALIDASA wrote the drama with the king's life there as the theme. Sanskrit literature records that Agnimitra had another name, SUDRAKA;[16] SUDRAKA was also a great literary figure and one of the best dramas in Sanskrit the *Mṛcchakaṭika*, is attributed to king SUDRAKA. In BANA's *Kādambarī* the hero is king SUDRAKA who lived at Vidisa. He too took great interest in literature. All these things put together lend support to the theory that KALIDASA was a great friend of Agnimitra and there is no objection to his having written a drama with his own friend, the king as the hero. We do not know whether Agnimitra was alive at the time when the drama was written and whether he had personally witnessed its performance. If he had, he would have enjoyed the scenes where he himself appeared in the role of a submissive lover.

In one of the two Epics of KALIDASA[17] there is a hint that India was really far more extensive at his time than what it is now, and perhaps the India that KALIDASA had in mind included the portion of the Persian Empire which the Greek Ruler of Persia, Seleukus Nikator, the successor of Alexander, had ceded to Chaudragupta. In the other,[18] there is a sort of grief about the loss to India of considerable portions of its territory due to the wickedness and inefficiency of its rulers. I will deal with such veiled allegories in the last section of this course of lectures when I spek of "Our India" at the time of KALIDASA. If these allegories which I read into the works of KALIDASA have any value, the time of KALIDASA as coming immediately after the extermination of the Mouryas is quite reasonable. There are other evidences also which support such a view; the social life where Brahmins ate meat agrees with such a date for KALIDASA. It is impossible that at the time of the Guptas, the Brahmins in India could have been eating meat.[19] Further KALIDASA did not know the *Purāṇas* as we have them, and the *Purāṇas* were put into their present form under the auspices of the Gupta kings. These and other evidences support a far earlier date for KALIDASA than what is assigned to him as the contemporary of a Vikramaditya either of 56 B. C. or of the Gupta dynasty. All that I can say at this stage is that the only evidence that has a semblance of reliability lies in the reference to Agnimitra and his capital Vidisa.

Nothing is known of the personal life of KALIDASA. He seems to have been in rather affluent circumstances; anyway there is not a hint about his having been in poor circumstances. There are many places in his works where he speaks of the conflict between wealth and learning, that the two do not exist in the same abode;[20] here there is no sort of personal touch, and it does not at all indicatc any resentment on his part against people who had wealth and who did not help a scholar and poet of his status in idigent circumstances. It is more a sort of rebuke towards kings and rich people who would not use their wealth for the advancement of culture and who are not in themselves particularly learned, an accomplishment which they could easily have acquired on account of their advantage of wealth. He speaks in very great appreciation about the liberality of kings towards people in poor circumstances who desire to get educated. He speaks of his heroes as educated and also as patrons of learning.[21] Thus there does not appear any personal grudge against rich people for their lack of sympathy towards him, for their lack of appreciation of poetic talents and of scholarships in people placed in positions of lesser advantage in point of wealth, like himself. We find a tone of contentment and satisfaction in the whole of his poetic works. If the general atmosphere of the poem reflects the life of the poet, then we can say that KALIDASA must have been enjoying a sort of easy life without any financial worries and troubles in his family life or difficulties from other people.

We do not know where he was born, what the condition of his parents were, what the family position was when he was born and in his younger days, and what contribution he made towards the improvement of his family conditions. We see only a complete blank when we think of such personal matters relating to his life. We may conclude that he had a very liberal education. His knowledge of various subjects is very accurate and intimate. Apart from grammar and philosophy, he knew various scientific subjects, especially medicine, and he must have been proficient in music, dancing, painting and other fine arts. He makes mention of astronomy very often; but I am not equally certain whether his knowledge in this science was of a very high order. My own feeling is that astronomy had not been developed to a very high degree in India at that time, though astronomy was one of the subjects of study mentioned in all forms of literature that enumerate the various subjects, even from the earliest times. But his knowledge of other subjects is not what a genius could acquire; there is much of accuracy and a very intimate acquaintance with details, which only a study can give to a person.

But the Indian tradition is that he was not particularly educated in his younger days and that he acquired his knowledge from a boon of the goddess Kali. There are also some stories about KALIDASA's natural brilliance and genius in contrast to the erudition of BHAVABHTUI another great poet of India, who is spoken of as a possible rival to KALIDASA. We cannot say anything about the subject, as we have seen poets who did not have any education, but who show extraordinary knowledge of various subjects with depth, width and accuracy in details. All that we can say is that the poems of KALIDASA reveal a thorough knowledge of various subjects. But it seems that the *Purāṇas* (Epics) known to him are not what are current now. Many anecdotes that are found in his works are not met with in the extent *Purāṇas*,[22] and some are in conflict with them.[23]. He does not seem to have derived his information from the *Mahābhārata* and the *Rāmāyaṇa* that we have now with us. There are three references to the story of *Rāmāyaṇa* in his *Meghadūta*[24] which show that he knew the story as it is now current; to the actual story of the *Mahābhārata*, he makes only a single reference and that in the *Meghadūta*.[25] He was well acquainted with the story of Shree Krishna as an incarnation of Vishnu, born as a cow-herd boy.[26] But he does not seem to make a hard and fast distinction between the real Vishnu and the incarnation of Krishna. In later epics Vishnu is never mentioned as Krishna, while in the *Raghuvaṁśa* the term used for Vishnu is Krishna.[27] Further Kaliya, who in the *Bhāgavata* is a dragon, is spoken of more as a victim of oppression by the divine bird *Garuḍa* in the *Raghuvaṁśa*.[28] The evidences are too slender in such matters to come to any reliable conclusion, though we can refer to such points in dealing with KALIDASA.

KALIDASA must have travelled extensively in India, rather in what he considered as the real India, as found in his *Raghuvaṁśa*; and this real India extended much farther to the west than what we know at present, and on the western side, it extended far to the north also. What he says about the various regions is something which a scholar sitting at his desk cannot know; there is a sort of personal and direct acquaintance with those regions. In the *Meghadūta*, the descriptions of the various places through which the cloud has to pass in his journey is more or less of a general nature; it is in the *Raghuvaṁśa* that he makes a detailed description of practically the entire India, when he describes the March of Victory undertaken by Raghu immediately after he became king. In describing the various kings who had assembled at the wedding of Indumati, from among whom the bride is to make a choice of her husband, he makes references to the conditions in the various countries. The March of Victory is along the coastal region, and the descriptions of the kings assembled for the wedding include also countries that are in the inland regions. The cultivation in the Delta region of the Ganges,[29] the cloves brought from Sumatra to Kalinga,[30] the elephants that sport in the Kavery river,[31] the cocoa-nut palms,[32] the arecanut palms and the betel creepers winding round the arecanut palms;[33] the sandal trees giving shades in the forests and the elephants enjoying the cool places under the trees,[34] and the cloves and the cardemons all described in appropriate places show that he knew the places personally. The description of the Parasikas (Persians) where girls enjoy a drink of wine,[35] the country of Huns further to the north,[36] Kashmir with its saffron growing in the fields,[37] the Himalayas with the tall Devadaru trees[38] and the lions couching on the ground with their necks turned back[39] and the inhabitants of the mountain regions,[40] also indicates his personal knowledge of the various regions.

He knew city life very intimately; but it is not at all certain whether he lived in the courts of kings enjoying their patronage. There are some stories about the official career assigned to him as ambassodor and in other capacities. But they have little value for a historical study. They are all tales created at a later date to explain the so-called preference that he shows to kings. There is a view that the *Meghadūta* was written when he was himself away from his home during some such mission. But when we examine his works, we find that he was not a great admirer of kings and official pomps; this point will be taken up in a later section. Further there had been various court poets whe were styled KALIDASA and many of the tales might have been first associated with such later KALIDASAS. The very fact that a theory arose about KALIDASA's centemporaniety with a great king called Vikramaditya is based on the assumption that he enjoyed the patronage of a king. But from the works of KALIDASA the impression that we get is that he was not the man to look for or to accept any such patronage. He was too proud of his profession as a poet and too independent to stoop to such humiliating positions. It he had been a contemperary of Agnimitra, which is quite possible, he must have lived in his palace as a great friend and as a colleague in his literary pursuits and not as a protege. The only other king of whom he seems to have some personal admiration is the king of tbe Angas. About him he says in the descrition of kings at the wedding of Indumati:

> In him wealth and learning, which by nature have different abodes, find a common resort; on account of your beauty and your sweet words, O girl of blessings, you are the only fit companion as a third.[41]

But when the girl did not seem to be satisfied with that king, the poet says:

> It is not that he is not fit for her love; it is not that she did not know how to choose. Different people have different tastes.[42]

It is only in this case that I find a sort of personal regret that the bride did not choose that king. And that shows some sort of partiality for that king. Otherwise, he did not care for kings and I will show this in detail in later sections.

He might have been living in oppulent cities; but he must have spent much of his time in the country parts. He loved Nature. He enjoyed art. He was proud of his profession. He considered his art as the most valuable thing in this world. He saw only beauty around him. Even in what are supposed to be ugly, he could locate beauty, because to him beauty is a matter of harmony between different things, and things appear ugly because people are not able to see the true relation of a thing with its environments. I will deal with this point also at a later stage, in another section. He lived in the company of the objects of Nature and saw the whole world as a single unit, comprising the objects of animate and inanimate Nature and this world and the world beyond.

Perhaps he was a Brahmin by birth. Tradition says that he was a shepherd-boy and not a Brahmin. Perhaps in his time such distinctions had little significance. He was a worshipper of Siva as *Ardhanārīśvara*[43] (Siva with half of himself as Parvati), Siva as *Aṣṭamūrti*[44] consisting of the eight aspects mentioned in the religious literature of India. But he was not a sectarian; he was not a fanatic. He had only a personal preference for the Deity in that form. He did not care much for kings and for priests, and that is why we find so little of palaces and temples and the forms and ceremonials of courts and the nature of worship in temples. His descriptions are confined to men and to the objects of Nature.

It is rather surprising that he has left so little of literary wealth to us, just two epics, a short lyric and three dramas. But it must be remembered that there is no author who has left for us more literature in the Sanskrit language. BHAVABHUTI has left for us three dramas and nothing more. So has the poet-king HARSHA of Kanouj. In the case of all other important works, either epics or dramas, there is only one specimen from the pen of distinguished authors in Sanskrit. Thus there is the drama, *Mṛcchakaṭika* attributed to SUDRAKA, the drama *Mudrārākṣasa* by VISAKHADATTA and *Veṇīsaṁhāra* by NARAYANA. In the case of VISAKHADATTA, there is mention of another *Devīcandragupta,* of which fragments have been preserved as cited in some work on literary criticism. There are Epics like the *Kirātārjunīyā* by BHARAVI and the *Śisupālavadha* by MAGHA and the *Naiṣadhīyacarita* by HARSHA. Nothing more has been handed down to us from these writers. HARSHA who wrote the epic of *Naiṣadhīyacarita* has written a philosophical work on Vedanta, and BHAVABHUTI is mentioned as having been an authority on philosophical subjects having written important works, before he became a poet.

Everything that a poet wrote is not real poetry. They must have written far more; but they did not consider them all as real poetry worthy of being transmitted to posterity, and posterity too did not think them worthy of preservation even if they had passed on through some generation. Just as nothing about the personal history of the poets have been preserved, their minor and occasional writings were also obliterated in course of time. We have to examine what has been preserved for us as specimens of good literature and not as products from the pen of a particular poet. The personal aspect has no place in evaluating the literary merits. Thus we will have to study the works of KALIDASA without any consideration for the personal details of the poet.

However much historians may regret the absence of material regarding the great poet, it is better that we do not have any such information of a personal nature about the poet. We are able to study the poetry as art without any personal bias, without any consideration regarding the author and the country and the time. In this way we are in a position to judge the universal aspect of the art. And there is the further advantage that our attention is not detracted from the art by considerations of a personal nature. Take for example the history of Shakesperian criticism. How much time is spent in determining the personality of the dramatist, the place of this birth, his parentage, his early life, his family relationships, his education, his avocation, his patrons and his relation with the important personalities of the time, his own identity attempted to be determined from his signatures and from entries in official records. After all this, there has arisen the question whether SHAKESPEARE wrote the dramas of SHAKESPEARE or whether it was LORD BACON. Not a single one of these points, even when determined with the maximum accuracy, can be of any help to us in trying to understand the art.

The art is within the art itself, and external points relating to the author and his time and his nativity have nothing to do with the value of the art.

In ancient India, the literary critics confined their attention to the evaluation of the artistic merits and to the understanding and appreciation of the art. Thus, the important question that we have to consider is whether there is an element of art that can give joy to persons with artistic gifts. At the time when KALIDASA became known to the modern world, there has been some sort of political prejudice against what is Indian. This has considerably affected the study of KALIDASA. Its full value to the nation and to humanity has not been appreciated. The estimation of the cultural value of KALIDASA has been affected by this prejudice, while the available knowledge of history has not been utilised to lessen this prejudice and its unfortunate effects. From the historical standpoint, can we say that the environments of KALIDASA were less favourable than the environments of the Greek Classics or the Classics in the modern languages for the production of art that can appeal to the modern man? We have also to consider the nature of the ages through which the two sets of literatures have passed, and the process of the application of a sieve that filtered the literature, arresting what was not worthy of being passed on to posterity, what cannot be regarded as true art, from a previous age. Can we say that the peoples who examined the literatures of the west from the time of the Greek civilisation could have had a better capacity to discriminate between what is art and what is not art and to pass on to us what they considered as art and to stop the flow of what they did not consider as art?

It is true that in modern times, the works of KALIDASA do not have the same appeal to the readers of literature as, say, the works of SHAKESPEARE and other great writers of England. Is it really because the works of KALIDASA are of lesser artistic value or is it because the minds of modern people have not been properly prepared for the reception of the art contained in the works of KALIDASA, in the same way in which the minds of people are being prepared to receive the art contained in the works of SHAKESPEARE and other poets and writers of England? Can a mind properly prepared for the reception of art, really respond to the radiations of artistic waves emenating from the works of KALIDASA? Is it the difficiency in the art of KALIDASA or is it the lack of prepation for the modern minds, that is responsible for this neglect of the art contained in Indian literature?

The same art responds in different ways to different peoples in different times and in different countries, according to the way in which the mind is tuned and to the relation of such attunement to the nature of the art. Shakespearean criticism had a chequered career: SHAKESPEARE is not appreciated in the same way in the different ages and in the different countries. There had been attempts also to re-write SHAKESPEARE even in England. There had been different judgments regarding his art. The same has been the case with KALIDASA also.

Modern minds do not respond to the art of KALIDASA in the same way in which it had appeared to the people of another age. The standards too had been different in ancient times which we may not be prepared to adopt for measuring the artistic values of KALIDASA. My effort is to apply modern standards, especially those that are current in England and in Germany, to the study of KALIDASA, so that we may see whether there can be a revival of the appreciative study of KALIDASA, replacing its study either as "oriental literature" or as "our glorious heritage". Is it art? Can it appeal as art to the modern man?

KINGS

Any one who reads the works of KALIDASA even in the most casual way will find what an important place the kings are given in the works. It is poetry about kings. In the three dramas the hero is a king. The *Raghuvaṁśa* deals with the kings of the Raghu Dynasty, a branch of the Solar Dynasty. The *Kumārasambhava* has as its theme the marriage of Parvati, daughter of Himavan conceived as the king of mountains, with the great God Siva. The *Meghadūta* treats of the palace of the king of the Vidyadharas known by the name of Kubera and a high official in his court.

This association of literary art with kings is not a peculairity in the works of KALIDASA; in ancient literature, it is difficult to find a specimen of literary art in any country in which kings do not hold a very important part. It is so in Greece and Rome in the West. It is so in the case of the other famous authors in Sanskrit literature. In the case of SHAKESPEARE, if the dramas about kings are weeded out, how many will then remain ? Thus it must be understood that kings play an important role not merely in KALIDASA, not merely in Sanskrit Literature, but also in practically the whole of ancient literature in all the countries of the world.

Yet, in studying the literary wealth of other countries, the critics do not indulge in talking about "Court Poetry", poetry written by poets who were patronised by kings, who lived in the palace of the kings and who received immense rewards for writing such poems about their patron kings. If a king like Harsha is known to have written a literary work,[1] the first judgment is that it must have been written by a court poet and fatherd on the patron king in return for favours and rewards. I know that even in Indian tradition there are stories about kings having rewarded poets who wrote poetry and allowed such poetry to go out in the name of the king.[2] But it is only a rare feature in the history of literary criticism in India; in modern times it has become a general rule. Not only this; there is a vigorous effort to associate all famous poets with some patron kings.

In the case of KALIDASA, the most ineffective way to know something about the author and his art is to attempt to associate him with a king. I do not deny the fact that a day came in the history of the development of Sanskrit Literatute when poets resorted to kings in expectation of their propitiation and the consequent advantages of wealth and fame from such associations with kings. But KALIDASA lived prior to this decadence in the life of the people. KALIDASA's object was to revive the Vedic tradition, and he followed the same path which VALMIKI in his *Rāmāyaṇa* and VEDAVYASA in his *Mahābhārata* had been treading. If there is one important collection of ancient literature in the world which is fairly free from kings and their associates, the priests, it is the *Ṛgvedic* literature. There, men and gods and Nature completed the chief things in this world. Man approached gods directly without the mediation of a priest, and kings whose profession was conquest were kept in the back-ground. The notion of a supreme godhead, which helped in establishing in the minds of the credulous people the supremacy of the king among men, came to India much later from foreign sources, and on account of this foreign influence, kings began to acquire a high position in the affairs of men, along with the priests, VEDAVYASA and VALMIKI and KALIDASA found themselves in a world fallen down into this decadent stage, and their sole effort was to revive the Vedic tradition of the importance of man and to keep kings and priests and heaven in their right places, if they had a place at all in life. But they could not deny the facts of their environment. Just as in modern times no one can put forward a theory unless it conforms to certain accepted principles in science like the Evolution Theory, in the days when KALIDASA and other great poets of India, who were the real saviours of India, lived, the position of the kings had become rather well established in the minds of the population, and if they completely ignored these facts in the life of the people, they could not get at the people. That is the only importance of the kings in the works of KALIDASA. They are there; but they are not what KALIDASA really wanted for his art.

The Greek poets selected their theme for their art from the well-known tales current in their times, and Aristotle formulated his theories of poetic art on the basis of the literature available to him. Similarly, KALIDASA also selected the stories current in his times and well known to the people, as theme for his poetic art. But KALIDASA had to wait for a long time before some one really understood his art, I mean the author of the *Dhvanyāloka*, ANANDAVARDHANA. If I have any confidence in the judgment of ANANDAVARDHANA it is due to the fact that he recognised the *Mahābhārata*[3] as a great literary work. The *Rāmāyaṇa* and the works of KALIDASA had the tradition of being masterpieces in literature; but the credit for recognising the *Mahābhārata* as a masterpiece in Sanskrit literature goes to ANANDAVARDHANA. And

ANANDAVARDHANA estimates the literary value of the works of KALIDASA for its real art, without any reference to kings.

But prior to ANANDAVARDHANA, the critics in the field of Sanskrit Literature took a very formal view of literary values. They had prepared some set standards and they measured every literary piece with these standards. Thus in a Drama the hero, who is mostly a king and sometimes a great personage of the times related to the king, was looked upon as the most important person, and the minor characters were neglected. There were certain great qualities associated with a perfect hero in a Drama, and the critics tried to analyse the Drama to show that the poet had satisfied the tests so conducted with their set standards. Nature played no part in the literary values of poetic works according to those critics. The plot was analysed according to certain pre-fabricated rules regarding the development of plots.

It is this tradition which the modern scholars of Sanskrit Literature inherited, and they made matters worse by denying even a high literary value or cultural significance for the poetry in Sanskrit Literature. At least in ancient times, they had attached high literary values, though they attached such values by the application of wrong standards. Now we have again to go back to ANANDAVARDHANA and estimate the value of the works of KALIDASA on its real artistic merits, leaving off all set standards; a literary work is not an official statement from the pen of a protege of kings giving details about the great qualities of kings. A poem is to be judged for its relation to the world and its realities, and kings as kings play a very subordinate role in the actual affairs of the world. So in the revised judgment of KALIDASA's works, kings must be taken as characters and not as kings. Being men, kings cannot be completely eliminated from the scope of literary art; but they cannot claim any superior role in life as kings. I am looking at the kings in the works of KALIDASA from these two angles, one that they are human beings with a position in life and the other that they are the most manifest to the minds of the peoples of the time when KALIDASA wrote his works. But what is most manifest is not often the most significant. The effort of a literary critic should be to find out the most significant from among, or through, what are most manifest.

The Vedic literature contains a large number of popular tales, and it is seldom that we find a king playing a prominent role in those tales. But KALIDASA did not select such tales for his art since people were more accustomed to kings than to ordinary people. We do not know where he got the material for his poetry from; it may be from works like the *Mahābhārata* or it may be from the large number of stories current in his time, well known to the people. The theme of two of his dramas, the *Vikramorvaśīya* and the *Śākuntala* are known in Vedic times, and they are found in the *Mahābhārata* also. The kings found in the *Raghuvaṁśa* also are ancient kings about whom there must have been current at that time a large number of stories. He selected the stories, because they were well known and not because they had kings as heroes. Thus the king as a hero is not a necessity for KALIDASA in his art; they formed a convenience for him, to make his art appeal to the people of his time. He knew also that his art would not suffer because the art was associated with kings, in so far as he treated them as human beings and not at all as kings.

The epic named the *Raghuvaṁśa*, as the name signifies, is the real "Book of Kings" from the pen of KALIDASA, and I take this work of KALIDASA for detailed examination to show what KALIDASA thought of kings and what relation he himself could have had with kings in his own life. This is of great importance to understand KALIDASA,. It is due to the examination of KALIDASA from a particular angle that all sorts of stories have gathered round the personality of KALIDASA, like his being the protege of a great king named Vikramaditya. Generally he is described as a court poet, living in the palace of the patron king, enjoying life in immense luxury, moving freely in the harem, pleasing the women-folk in the king's court through his poetry and his wits and his flatteries, being a companion to the king when the king wanted some relaxation after his heavy work. The whole question of his date being centred round a Vikramaditya is also the result of such an acceptance of KALIDASA as a court poet of a great king. I am interested in the personality of KALIDASA and his date only to understand his art, extricated from all entanglements with a king.

KALIDASA starts his poem, the *Raghuvaṁśa*, with a descrition in four verses, of the great qualities of the kings of the Dynasty of Raghu, about whom he proposed to write a long poem, being charmed by their great qualities. In each quarter of the four verses, he mentions a quality and in this way there are sixteen qualities enumerated. Most of them are what we find in a great man, and some are specially associated with kings- Thus they are the lords of the earth as far as the ocean, they worked for victory to acquire fame and they punished the criminals according to their crime. Only these three are what can be called qualities specially associated with royal personages. Then he introduces the specific subject matter by mentioning Manu, the first king, son of Vivasvat, and in his dynasty was born a king named Dilipa.

It is at this stage that we find the long description of this great king with whose exploits the poem starts;[4] he is the father of Raghu whose name is associated with the new dynasty, and the term *Rāghava* (the progeny of Raghu) is a very familiar term in the *Rāmāyaṇa*. Here there are eighteen verses describing the personality of the great king. Unusually when a king is described, we see a great palace, with all sorts of luxuries, a palace in many storeys reaching even the path of the sun and the moon, the king himself sitting on his throne studded with gems, with feudatory kings prostrating at his feet, with army and with all sorts of paraphernalia like an umbrella and fans, with bards singing their glories and with all such accompaniments that make a person a real monarch. But KALIDASA has not a word to say about anything that is usually associated with the greatness and pomp and ceremonies in a royal court. There is no mention of a minister, there is no mention of a commander-in-chief of the army; there is a solitary mention of the army,[5] only to say that he never wanted an army except to keep up the forms of a royal court. He depended only on his personal qualities of valour and intelligence to carry on his duties as a ruler of the country. All the qualities that make any man great are mentioned and no quality that makes a king prominent in the eyes of the people, without making him a really great man, is even hinted at. After describing the form and stature of the king, he says that his intelligence was worthy of his stature, and his appearance and his undertakings were worthy of his intelligence and the results of his undertakings were worthy of them.[6]

Here there is some important point that is more or less peculiar to KALIDASA in Sanskrit Literature. No other poet associates good qualities with a good appearance in such a prominent way. It is not enough if a person has a good character; the good character must be presented in a good appearance and good physical form. It is not enough if a gem is good; it is necessary that it is set properly, in good surroundings. It is not enough if a painting is good; it is necessary that it is put in a good frame also, and has good border decorations and appropriate background. It is the same relation which good qualities, good character, has to a good body and a good appearance. Much is said of the efforts of the Greeks to develop their bodies through physical exercises in their gymnasiums. Even the Greeks who attached such value to a well developed body and good appearance in a true Hellenes, did not closely associate such appearance with a good character. KALIDASA says the same thing in the *Śakuntala* also. When the hero appears in the hermitage of the foster-father of the heroine, the companions of the heroine say that from the appearance of the guest, it could be gathered that he must have a really great and noble character.[7] When later the hero had married and left the heroine promising to send suitable ascorts for her to go to the palace of the hero and when there was a fear that the escorts may not come, one of the companions of the heroine says that having regard to the good appearance of the hero, it is impossible that he should betray the heroine.[8] KALIDASA was full of appreciation of a good physical form and attractive appearance in so far as only such a body can properly hold a good character. Now I return to the point.

On account of his royal qualities majestic, yet attractive, he became easily accessible to the people who had to work near about him, and at the same time they could nat be aggressive to him, like the ocean with its gems deposited in its bottom and also with the terrible sea animals roaming about in it.[9] He took tributes from the subjects only for their own prosperity; indeed the sun draws water from the earth only to pour down a thousand times of water.[10] To him the army was only a retinue; he had only two means for accomplishing his objectives, one being his own intellectual attainments which never fail in any subject and the other being the bow on which the string has been tied.[11] When his policies are kept confidential, and when he conceals his own intentions, the things that he undertakes can only be inferred from the results.[12] There is silence in knowledge; there is patience in power; there is abstention from self-praise in gifts; in this way, his virtues are followed up by other qualities, likes brothers coming one after the other.[13] Unattracted by the pleasures of this world, having reached the other shore of the ocean of learning, intensely attached to virtues, he without old-age and grey hairs, still became an elderly person.[14] A person, even if he has courted his anger, wins his approbation, if he acts in a good way, like a medicine in the case of one who falls ill; similarly, even his favourites are abandoned by him if they do anything evil, like the finger when bitten by a snake.'[15] These are some of the specimens selected from the description of the king in the *Raghuvaṁśa* to indicate the general trend; the selection does not conceal anything that may go against my thesis. And my thesis is that according to KALIDASA, a ruler is great only if he is a great man in himself, and that an official position has nothing to do with the greatness of even the Head of the State and of the Government.

There are usually two high offices in a State; one is the office of the Head of the State and the other is the office of the Head of the Government of the State. Sometimes these two offices are united into one; in modern times it is seldom that the two offices are held by the same person. We live in an age of Democracy, where the Head of the State only reigns, while it is the Head of the Government, usually designated the Prime Minister, who actually governs the state. The two offices are combined in one when the Head of the State is an autocrat, who has no limitations from a constitution for the State, or sometimes the Constitution itself combines the two offices in one person.

In ancient India, it was more or less the rule that the Head of the State also governs the country, instead of simply reigning with the task of the government left to a Prime Minister. It is when an autocracy is converted into a democracy either by limiting the powers of the Head of the State and passing on his powers to the representatives of the people or by replacing an autocratic ruler by a representative of the people, that the Head of the State is reduced to a symbol of the unity of the nation, with the representative of the people taking up the full powers and responsibilities of the government. In ancient India there was no need either to limit the powers of an autocrat or to replace him by a representative of the people. The Head of the State was always a representative of the people, and he could not remain in that position unless he had the confidence of the people. He does not occupy the position merely through his right of heredity; nor is he there through the accidents of a ballot box. He is there because he satisfies the conditions for occupying the position, prescribed by national conventions, and there were the wise people who protected such national conventions. Neither the priesthood nor the army could retain an autocrat in the position of the Head of the State against the will and consent of such protectors of national welfare. As such the character of the Head of the State counted much in the welfare of the people; if he does not satisfy the conditions prescribed for the position, he cannot remain there, and frequent change in the occupant of that position was detrimental to the welfare of the State.

KALIDASA wanted to show that if a person is raised to the position of the Head of the State, who automatically becomes the Head of the Government also, either by the power of the army as an autocrat, or by the accident of birth, he does not thereby become also a great man. He can be a great occupant of that place only if he is already a great man. Thus greatness must be antecedent to occupying the position of the Head of the State (along with the position of the Head of the Government) and

BVBSSMV G31

not its consequence. A king as a king is not an object of honour if he is not also a great man, and a man as a man is an object of such honour if he is a great man, even if he does not occupy any such high position of office. When honour is determined by personal worth and not by the position that a person occupies, there is no need nor occasion to scramble for such positions. Such office brings with it only an additional burden and responsibility and not at all a source of greater profit by way of honour or enjoyments in life. This point in the political doctrines of KALIDASA is made quite clear in the *Śākuntala* when the hero says; "When one is installed safely on the throne, it simply puts an end to a long sherished desire, and this installation on the throne brings along with it troubles by way of responsible work attached to the government of the State; one connot say that one took up the position to court additional burden, nor can one say that it was to ease one's burdens: it is just like an umbrella held in one's hand".[16] One does not take an umbrella to make it a burden, nor does the umbrella remove the fatigue very much; and a kingdom is just like that.

KALIDASA gave the picture of a great person who is to be the Head of the State and also of the Government, by describing him as a great man. In this description there is not even a hint of the pomp and power attached to the position. There are no palaces with their lustre and luxuries; there are no ministers; there is no army and no commonder-in-chief. There are no bards singing glories of him; there are no feudatory kings prostrating before him, while he would be sitting on the throne. One can find a reflection of this description in the *Śākuntala*, where too the ministers and the army and the commander-in-chief play no part; here, the commander-in-chief is once introduced, and that for a short time, after which he is dismissed as having no function in the plot of the drama.[17]

After this description of the king as a great man, without even a hint of the glories attached to the throne, KALIDASA takes the king out of his palace, which is not even mentioned in the Epic. It is only once in the first eight Cantos of the Epic that there is a mention of the Capital City of the king,[18] and that when KALIDASA describes the son of this first king, to say that the people of the whole Capital City admired the liberality of that king. We see the king only in the forest. in the hermitage of his family preceptor. The king was growing old, and yet he was not blessed with a son who could worthily follow him on the throne.[19] He felt that there might be some supernatural obstacle to it and he wanted to consult his teacher who was living in the forest in his hermitage. For this purpopose, he had to temporarily place the burden of the day-to-day administration of the country in the hands of the ministers;[20] and this is one of the rare occasions when KALIDASA introduces a minister in his poem. He never advertises a minister in his poetry. The king started on his journey with a limited following, because he did not want any sort of disturbance in the hermitage of his teacher.[21] He wanted to see that his tours did not upset the general programmes of work by different agencies in his domain. No arrangements were made for receptions on the way. Although he did not have a large following during his journey, he had his inherent lustre, and on that account he was more impressive than if a large army had been escorting him.[22] KALIDASA never misses a chance to impress on his readers the difference between inherent worth and impressiveness on one side and external appendages on the other.

It is in this context that we find KALIDASA at his best. He never wanted the Head of the State and of the Government to be confined to the limitations of the high walls of a castle, with ministers and army and favourites surrounding him. He wanted the Head of the State to be in the free Nature of the world, surrounded by the objects of Nature like the animals and the birds, and the trees and the rivers and the common people. A king shines best as a man in such an atmosphere. The journey to the hermitage is described in a dozen verses.

The chariot in which he travelled with his queen made a rollong noise, deep and impressive;[23] the mild wind was blowing, pleasant in touch, fragrant with the contact of the blossoming trees, carrying with it the pollen from the flowers, and gently shaking the trees of the whole forest;[24] the pea-cocks responded to the noise of the chariot-wheels that appeared to them to be thunder, and produced their own prolonged melody that gave joy to the king and the queen;[25] there were the herds of deer gathered on the way, that did not run away on account of fear but simply moved off from the path and stared at the chariot with their fascinating eyes;[26] when the king and the queen lifted up their eyes, they saw a row of birds flying over them making a chirping sound and they appeared to be festoons tied aloft without poles, along the path to offer them a ceremonial reception;[27] the wind was favourable, which promised the final success of their mission, and the dust thrown out by the hoofs of the horses did not even touch them;[28] from the lotus ponds the fragrance of the lotus flowers were being wafted by the gentle breeze cool with the drops of water, and they enjoyed such fragrant breeze;[29] they received the presents from peoples in the villages who were carrying on their virtuous life, in the form of the remnants of their religious rites, and also their blessings and good wishes;[30] some elderly people in the cowherd settlements approached him with fresh curds (sour milk) as their humble presents and they were freely allowed to approach him; and not only this, the king showed his great consideration towards them by asking them questions about the trees in the forest;[31] the whole way the king pointed out various interesting objects to the queen, and he himself enjoyed their sight and in this way they did not realise that they had traversed such a long distance.[32]

This description is more appropriate to be dealt with in another lecture where I will have to talk about "Nature in KALIDASA." But I had to bring the point over here in order that I can point out the technique of KALIDASA. He is silent when the theme relates to the palace, but he enters on a long description when the scene is shifted to the forest and other places where he gets an opportunity to describe Nature. He brings the kings into close association with Nature. In this description what is most noteworthy is the mention of the villagers and their humble presents and the greetings and the blessings, and also the presence of the elders from the cowherd settlements in the forest. No local official is let in during this journey of the Head of the State and of the Government of the country. The king is in contact with the people of the villages and of the forests. The king is only one among the people and KALIDASA wants to emphasise the civic equality of the titizens of the State. Not only does KALIDASA bring the villagers and the elders of the forests face to face with the king; he also indicates the superiority of such people to the king in certain matters. The king did not want any arrangements to be made on the way for his needs by the officials of the State; he was happy to receive all the gifts from the common people; cheir greetings and their blessings were also of great value to the king. Not only this, a king brought up in the palace does not know the details about the trees in the forests and not even their names; and the king becomes wiser through his meetings with such humble folk in the country part· KALIDASA is a friend of the common people and his one object is to show the equality of the people in a State and also to show that if there is any sort of superiority, it is in the case of the common people who were brought up in the free Nature, while the kings were compelled to be confined to the limits of the high walls of a castle with no chance to see anything of the real Nature. He never allows the officials of the State to interfere with the people, and they are not even given a chance to be present when the kings go out on tours. Thus, later when the grandson of he first king goes to another kingdom in connection with his wedding, he enjoyed the arrangements made for his comforts on the way by the people of the country parts. While no official comes into the scene in the works of KALIDASA, the common people are always in the forefront. This will be elaborated in another lecture, and however much I may tap on the resources for indicating the point in this lecture there is still a rich reserve when the point has to be taken up for detailed treatment in the appropriate part of this course of lectures.

There is also a fairly long description of the hermitage of his family precepter with the disciples of the teacher and the girls and the wives of the Sages and the trees and the ponds and the fire and the antilopes and the birds.[33] The Teacher tells the king that he had neglected his duty once when he was returning from heaven after an interview with Indra in so far as he did not pay his respects to the celestial cow that was standing on the way and that it is this neglect of duty that is the supernatural obstacle to his getting a son;[34] he prescribes as the remedy some steps to propitiate the cow by attending on its daughter that was at that time present in the hermitage while the celectial cow herself was away in a distant region for some other purpose.[35] At this stage the first Canto ends and in the second Canto, we find the king as a cowherd himself, wandering in the forest following the cow like its shadow. He was living in the hermitage of the preceptor, leading a life of austere abstinence, sleeping on bare grass in a thatched cottage. It is not that the Sage could not command the means to give the king a royal reception; but he had to live within the limitations of certain vows during that time so that his service to the cow may have its full benefit.[36]

There are various touches in the description of the life of the king in the forest hermitage, that show the real nature of the king as a great man, because he was living like a common man not as a great king. When the king travels, there will usually be elaborate arrangements for his getting down from the chariot at the point of destination, like some stool for him to step out from the chariot and people also to help him and the queen. But when he reached the hermitage, his first consideration was to see that the horses that had drawn his chariot during such a long journey must be given rest,[37] and it is only after giving this instruction to the driver of the chariot that he gets down from the chariot; first he personally helps the queen to get down and then he comes down also.[38] This great consideration to the poor animals and the personal instructions given to the driver are very effective touches in the portrayal of the king as a great man, and not as a stiff Ruler of the State.

This chariot and the driver and the small retinue that had to follow, also disappear at this stage.[33] The king goes to the forest following the cow; even the queen does not accompany the king.[40] He is all alone. Here there is one of the most charming descriptions that I have seen anywhere in the literature of the world. Here is a king and he is given a royal reception by the objects of Nature in the forest, far more grand and impressive than what a king could have got in a city. He had no royal symbols about him and yet his natural lustre indicated his royal grandeur. A truly great king does not want any of such paraphernalia for being great. I reserve the description of the royal reception which he enjoyed in the forest from the objects of Nature, for another occasion when I have to deal with the problem of Nature in KALIDASA.

After a few days of stay in the forest leading the life of a simple cowherd, but being grander there than what he could be in a palace, when he was in the company of the objects of Nature, the daughter of the celestial cow whom he was tending wanted to make a real test of the true loyalty of the king, and one day when he was following the cow, but at the same time enjoying the view of the grand mountain scenery, the cow entered a cave and then made a shriek in terror as though some wild animal had attacked her. The king immediately went into the cave and found the cow about to be killed by a lion that was sitting on her back.[41] He did not have any hesitation or timidity; he immediately put his arrows on the string tied on to his bow, to shoot the lion down;[42] but to his great amazement he found that his hands were stuck to the end of the arrow and he became like a picture without any motion.[43] The lion told him that he was a servant of the great God Siva and that he was in charge of some trees that were dear to the Goddess Parvati and guarded the trees from being destroyed by the wild elephants by rubbing their neck against their trunk;[44] he had orders from the God that he could kill and eat the animals that came there, and so the cow became his legitimate prey.[45] The king offers his own body and entreats the lion to spare the cow that was in his charge.[46] But the lion rejects his offer and says;—The sole overlorship of the earth, with his power extending over the whole domain, young age, a charming body: if for the sake of a small thing, you ruin so much of wealth, I consider you as lacking in proper judgment.[47] If it is sympathy for living beings that prompts you to give up your body to save this cow, then also, after all, just a single cow remains safe after your death; and if you continue to live you can save all your subjects, O lord of your people, from various kinds of calamities.[48] If you are afraid of the Sage who may get angry on account of the loss of a single cow, you can easily appease him by offering him crores of cows yielding more milk than even this.[49] But the king prostrated before the lion and even fell on the earth with entrieaties for the safety of the cow and for accepting himself as a substitute,[50] and when he lifted up his eyes since no one picked him up as a prey, it was found that there was no lion and that the cow was standing there with a smiling face.[51] The cow was immensely pleased and she asked the king to drink her milk like a calf and she promised that he would be blessed with a son who would become the originator of a new dynasty.[52] The king had his desire fulfilled and he returned to the country, where the people were eagerly awaiting his return.[53] Here practically we come to the end of the story of this king; he appears only rarely after this, incidental to the description of his son Raghu.

KALIDASA does not narrate a story; he only paints a picture. In a picture we cannot have a story presented; it is only a scene from a story that can be so presented in a picture. He painted the picture of a king as leading a very austere life in a forest hermitage. He had a purpose in presenting such a picture; he wanted to show that a great king is great both on the throne as a king and in the forest as a common man. Having lived an active life, observing the various sides of the life of the nation, KALIDASA must have known many who come to the forefront of the people when they occupy a prominent position and who are reduced to nonentities when they move off from that position. It is so because the man becomes great only through association with a great position and not in himself. Instead of placing great persons in great positions, the usual practice is that common people are lifted to uncommon places and then there is some sort of a reflection of that greatness from that position on the man also, and this reflection vanishes when the man is removed from the place. KALIDASA wanted to show the futility of making people great by putting them in a great place. Real greatness is from within and not from the position in which a man is placed.

After achieving this object, he had to complete the whole picture with further portrayals, so that this partial presentation of his political philosophy may not destroy the very cause which he wanted to advocate. He did not want people to take it that a great man must live in a thatched mud cottage and must sleep on the bare floor with some grass spread there and that he should take to manual labour if he is to be a really great man, in so far as such a great man as Dilipa has lived such a life. He could not be unaware of great personalities who had lived the life of mendicants and who in that way had been able to drag away a large number of credulous and unthinking people from their true responsibilities in life. He did not at all want people to leave off the world in the hope of becoming great. It was the inherent greatness of the king that made him great even in the forest where he lived as a common labourer, and if any one lives in the forest in that same way, he will not for that reason, become an equally great man. Greatness in men exhibits itself in various ways. So what is wanted is not to imitate a form but to develop true greatness from within. To show this, KALIDASA takes up the next king and gives us quite a different picture of him as a great man; he too became a great king in another way on account of his inherent greatness. Indian tradition refers to three values in life. The term "value" has originally an economic significance. But it has acquired other meanings, as value of being true, value of being good and value of being beautiful. Indian tradition assigns quite different values to things in life, as *Dharma* or what is good, *Artha* or what is useful and *Kāma* or what is enjoyable. KALIDASA presented the value of *Dharma* or what is good in the description of Dilipa, and now he takes up the value of *Artha* or what is useful. This is the means to enjoyment, to living a full life. *Dharma* limits the scope of what is useful and what is enjoyable. After the description of this delimitation to the means and the end in life, he takes up the means itself in the description of Raghu.

After describing Dilipa as a man with a very high sense of duty, prepared to sacrifice all comforts in life for the sake of the kingdom KALIDASA now brings on the stage a very valiant hero, who fought with Indra when he was even a boy and who brought the entire earth under his power. This too he does as another form of service to the kingdom and to the nation. There must be unity in the country if the people are to prosper, and the Head of the State must represent that unity of the Nation. It is this cultural unity of the people, symbolised by the Head of the State that is now taken up by KALIDASA. It is not a question of mere conquest by the application of brutal force; the conquest is for the establishment of *Dharma* and this point KALIDASA makes clear when he speaks of Raghu as *Dharma-Vijayin* (one who conquers through the methods of *Dharma* and for the establishment of *Dharma*).[54]

In the description of Raghu also, we see nothing of a palace or of ministers or of army and army chiefs. The boy had a good education, which is emphasised in the description of the Hero.[55] The Head of the State who is also the Head of the Government, must be educated. The modern doctrine that the Head of the Government has only to satisfy the test of the ballot box and that his educational qualifications do not count, is not what KALIDASA would accept. The fact was emphasised in the description of Dilipa also, when he said that Dilipa's intellect was worthy of his physical stature and his appearance[56] and that he depended only on his unfailing intellect.[57] No one's intellect can be worthy of a great cause unless it is properly trained. It was the "Governess" that gave him the first training.[58] At a later stage proper teachers gave him instruction in the various subjects.[59] The training of the body and also of the intellect are very prominently described in the case of Raghu.[60] And when he became the king, being himself properly educated, he knew the value of education; he never pleaded the lack of funds for encouraging education in the State, which is one of the most unfortunate elements in modern democracy, where those who are in charge of the government are not required to have a real education and do not sufficiently recognise the importance of education in the welfare of the State. At a later stage in the description of this king, he is reported to have said, "A student who has reached the other shore of the ocean of learning, and who was in need of money for discharging his obligations to his teacher, could not get the help from Raghu and had to go to another iberal patron: such a reproach shall not descend on me for the first ltime".[61] I do not know whether in any country in modern times one responsible for the government of the country would make such a statement.

Like Dilipa, Raghu is also taken out of the palace. A king within a palace is no better than a decorated idol, before which people bring rich presents, in front of which people prosptrate, which is taken out in colourful processions with music and drumming, which is associated with various kinds of ceremonials and festivities. KALIDASA is not interested in such kings. He wanted kings to be great men, who for their personal worth are placed on the throne, to look after the welfare of the nation. That is why we find the kings of KALIDASA outside the palace and never in the palace sitting on a throne. This is in keeping with what VEDAVYASA and VALMIKI also have done. Neither in the *Mahābhārata* nor in the *Rāmāyaṇa* do we find much of the hero sitting on the throne. Yudhishsthira had a dose of wanderings incognite when he was a boy, along with his mother and the brothers, and as soon as he was installed on the throne, he was taken out of the kingdom, and we see him in the forest. As soon as he wins back his throne, the whole Epic practically comes to an end. There is little of narration remaining after his return to the kingdom from the forest. The same is the case with the *Rāmāyaṇa* also, where we find Sri Rama taken out of the palace in his boyhood and soon after his return, he was not crowned as the heir-apparent, but was sent out to the forest. The best part of the Epic is contained in this stage of wandering in the forest. A close student can find many other similarities among the trio of the great poets in India.

In the description of Raghu, KALIDASA makes an improvement, and he goes a step further than in the case of his father. In the case of Dilipa, what KALIDASA wanted was to bring him in relation to the world outside and with the common people. So he was taken to the forest and left there. In the case of Raghu, he wanted him to study the conditions of the various countries and also their several customs and manners, by personal contacts; and this is a very necessary thing for the Head of the Government of a country. The need to bring the hero into contact with the objects of free Nature and with the common people is not at all neglected. Raghu goes from place to place, and the customs and manners and the conditions of the countries are mentioned during the description of his "March of Victory."

His was more a study tour, and there is the higher object in the form of bringing about unity in the whole country. There is nothing that can be called an ivasion of one country by the ruler of another country. Raghu never wanted to plunder and to ruin the countries where he went nor to molest the people and harm the womenfolk. Sword and fire played no part in his march. There were fights which cannot be avoided in such a context. And to that extent, the symbol of kingship in the form of an army cannot be kept out of view. But considering the context it is wonderful how KALIDASA keeps wars out of view and how he brings the objects of Nature into the forefront. This point too will be further elaborated in the proper situation, namely, the description of Nature in KALIDASA.

He did not even remove a king from the throne where he was installed. He wanted them to accept the unity of the country as represented by himself. When they accepted that symbol of unity in the king, he allowed them to continue to rule the country. Thus in the case of the Sumhas, the king simply surrendered without a fight;[62] the ruler of Vanga was first uprooted and then replaced, like rice stalks in a field;[63] he took away the splendour of the prowess of the king of Kalinga and did not deprive him of his throne.[64] In this way he went to the East and then to the South along the coast and turned on to the West coast at the southern end of the peninsula, and marching along the coast, he went to Persia and then to the North and traced his path back to India from the northern side of the Himalayas. Thus he brought the whole country under a unified rule.

When Raghu returned from this rather protracted tour for unifying the country, he performed a great "Sacrifice" called the *Viśvajit* (conquest of the whole country) in which he had to give away all the wealth that he had accumulated till that time, and he becomes a very poor man.[65] Thus he did not bring any booty from the places that he conquered for his own enjoyment or for the pleasures of those who had accompanied him in the March of Victory. Even what he had in his own treasury he had to distribute among the people; it was in this state that a student went to him for money to discharge his obligations to his teacher from whom he had acquired all learning.[66] The king had to receive this young student with mud vessels, since he had given away all the gold that he had in his palace.[67] When distinguished people come, it is the usual custom among kings to offer them a reception using only gold vessels. The student informed him of his requirements and knowing his position, he said, "Therefore I will go elsewhere to try and get the money that I want for discharging my obligations to my teacher; I have no other purpose."[68] It is at this stage that the great king said, "A student who has reached the other shore of the ocean of learning, and who was in need of money for discharging his obligations to his teacher, could not get the help from the side of Raghu and had to go to another liberal patron: such a reproach shall not descend on me for the first time."[69]

Here some explanation is necessary to understand the position. In those days, the students give no fee and no boarding charge during their education. When the student finishes his studies, he usually asks the teacher what he may do at the end of the study by way of payment for his education. Even in the Upanishads it is enjoined on the students that when he returns home after his education, he should not forget the educational institution where he had his education, but shall bring to the teacher whatever financial aid he would be able to render to the teacher for the maintenance of the institution.[70] In many cases the teacher would simply say that he was immensely pleased with his conduct during his stay at the institution and with his studies, and that he need not worry about bringing any money to him. In this case, when the teacher told the disciple that he did not want any such gift, the disciple insisted on doing something and the teacher was a little annoyed with the disciple's persistence in the matter; he hold him that if he was so very particular, he should bring "fourteen crores"[71] and that is not a small thing for any one to accomplish. That is why he had to go to the king.

Raghu asked the student to remain in his palace for two or three days promising that he would bring him the amount that he wanted.[72] He decided to go to Vaisravana, and get the amount from him, in so far as he was the only source from which he could secure such a large amount immediately.[73] Evidently Vaisravana had information about his intentions through his supernatural vision, being semi-divine, and did not want an invasion of such a great hero ; at night he filled Raghu's treasury with immense gold and gems, and in the morning when Raghu was about to start on his mission, the treasury keepers gave him information about the miracle it night in the treasury.[74] Then Raghu called that student to the treasury and asked him to take whatever he wanted.[75] At that time, there were two souls who were the objects of special congratulations from the entire populatiou of the city of Saketa: the disciple who refused to take anything more than what he wanted to fulfill his promise to the teacher and the king who insisted on the student taking far in excess of what he immediately wanted.[76] This is the only place in the whole of the first eight cantos of the Epic where the Capital City of the kings is mentioned.

These are the two main events in the story of Raghu that is taken up for treatment in the Epic. Then comes the story of his son named Aja. During the deseription of Raghu's march of victory, KALIDASA describes the country of Persia and the countyy to the north of it inhabited by the Huns. It is certain that he must have known much about these countries. Although he does not make any specific mention, he is likely to have heard of the conquests of Darius in Persia, and perhaps the invasion of Persia by Alexander. Except the words of the Greek historians whose aim is more to glorify their great adventurer, Alexander, and their own country, than to record the facts, there is nothing to show that Alexander had actually invaded India and had met with any sort of success. KALIDASA must have been aware of conquerors who brought ruin to the countries invaded by them, destroying cities, burning the villages, wiping out the whole population and depriving womenfolk of their honour. Such conquerors brought immense booty to their own country, and their followers too brought immense wealth to their homes after their plunder. Raghu was described by KALIDASA as a contrast to them, when one from India undertakes a march of victory; and such an undertaking was meant only for the unification of the country. Raghu did not go out of what was India at that time. All the countrics visited by Raghu during his March of Victory must have come within the seat of Indian culture. He did not go beyond Persia to the West, though there must have been countries known to KALIDASA at that time, further to the West. He did not allow Raghu to go further to the North beyond the country of the Huns. Why did not Raghu go to Syria and Asia Minor? Why did not Raghu go to China? This needs an explanation. That KALIDASA did not know the countries beyond is not a correct explanation. Countries like Egypt and China are well known in Indian tradition. KALIDASA himself mentions China as the country from which good silk comes to India. In the *Śākuntāla* the flag on the chariot is mentioned as China silk (*Cīnaṁśuka*),

To complete the picture of the full personality of a man, KALIDASA now takes up a new character for description, after describing Dilipa who was devoted to *Dharma* and Raghu who was devoted to *Artha*. Now comes Aja, the son of Raghu, on the scene. These three pictures together form a single unit, being the picture of a man living a full life, and what he adds is the picture of a man who recognised the value called *Kāma*, the enjoyment of life. When what is described in full about Dilipa is his life in the forest like an ordinary cowherd, tending a cow, and when what is described in full about Raghu is his March of Victory and his liberality and his patronage of education, what is described in full about Aja is his wedding and his grief at the loss of his queen at a later stage. The description of his grief brings to light the happy life that he enjoyed after his wedding.

The son was worthy of the father; KALIDASA says, "His physical formation and appearance is the same, his valour is the same, his position of eminence and majesty too is the same. The son did not at all differ from his father; he was like a torch lighted from a wick."[77] When he grew up and when he had finished his education, and when the royal splendour was only waiting for the permission of the father to find an abode in him,[78] the king of the Vidarbhas had decided on holding a *Svayaṁvara* form of marriage for his sister, named Indumati.[79] All the kings had been invited for the festival, so that the princess could make a choice from among those who would assemble there, as her husband. The young prince was not a mere prospective bride-groom. He was also a very valourous young man. When he started for the city of the Vidarbha king with a suitable retinue, he had to camp on the banks of the Narmada river and then a wild elephant came out of the river and created some commotion among the army, and the elephants in his army began to disregard their keepers and to turn their face away from this new elephant that came out of the river. Aja was not at all moved by this new danger which made he warriors in his army rather anxious about the safety of the womenfolk;[80] the knew that it is against the rules that a king should kill a wild elephant, and so he took his bow and arrow and discharged an arrow in a mild way so that it would compel the elephant to retire while it would not kill him.[81] As soon as that arrow struck his forehead, the form of the elephant disappeared, and to the great surprise of Aja, there stood before him a demi-god, shining with a lustre around him,[82] who told Aja that he had to assume the form of an elephant on account of the curse of a Sage, because he showed some slight disregard for him; but he was the son of the king of Gandharvas, and his name was Priyamvada.[83] The limit for the operation of the curse was when Aja of the dynasty of Ikshvaku would discharge an arrow on him and strike his forehead.[84] So, the Gandharva was immensely happy over the incident and gave Aja the knowledge of a new weapon called *Sammohana* (what creates stupor) which he could discharge and also withdraw, and with which he could conquer his enemies easily without killing them.[85]

In this way he reached the suburbs of the city of the Vidarbha king;[86] on the way, as usual, there was no State arrangements for his stay, and he accepted the arrangements made by the people of the country parts.[87] Considering the occasion, it was necessary that an army should accompany him as a retinue. At the edge of the city, the king of the Vidarbhas received him with due honours,[88] immensely pleased with the arrival of the son of Raghu.

Aja slept at night and early in the morning he woke up with the songs of the official bards;[89] here there is a beautiful description of the morning in nine verses,[90] and it has been the Indian tradition of Sanskrit scholarship that this is one of the most charming descriptions of Nature in the whole of the works of KALIDASA, and nearly every student knows this piece by-heart. Then comes the description of the Hall for the *Svayaṁvara,* where all the kings had already assembled and Aja too went there.[91] He is throughout described as a charming young man, worthy of being a bride-groom. People thought that Kamadeva (Lord of Love) himself had assumed a body and come down to the earth,[92] when they saw this prince. He walked up to the place reserved for him, ascorted by the king of the Vidarbhas himself, and it looked as though a young lion cub was ascending a hill.[93] He appeared to be a lighting flash which illuminated the row of kings who looked like clouds before him.[94] The bride made her appearance[95] and some elderly lady who knew all about the kings and their dynasties and their glories described all the kings one by one;[96] the princess was not at all satisfied with any one until she came to Aja.[97] The description of each king takes only three or four verses, and there is a very graphic pen picture of each king, in this context. Every king is presented with an individuality distinct from every other. When they came to Aja, Indumati, the Princess put the garland around his shoulder as an indication of her choice.[98] Then there is the actual wedding ceremony. The bride and the bride-groom go to the hall where the ceremonials are to be conducted. People hurry up in their homes to have a look at the pair.[99] The ceremony is also described[100] and Aja returns to his country with his wife. On the way the other kings waylaid him, being jealous of the success of this young prince; but Aja put the princess in charge of some trustworthy warriors and met the army of the kings himself and defeated them; [101] he used the weapon which he had received from the Gandharva on his way to the wedding. [102]

Aja became king[103] and Raghu retired to a garden close by to end his last days in contemplation.[104] Raghu knew that the new king was young and that the country might require his own presence in the vicinity if any danger should come to the kingdom.[105] This is in contrast to the way in which Raghu himself took over charge of the government of the kingdom; at that time his father simply retired, and Raghu was in sole charge of the responsibility. It is such small touches that give us the true picture of each. Raghu was described as a very valiant hero, and as such he had no need of his father's help even when as a young man he took up the burden of the government of the country. Aja is more a man to enjoy the world, and it is to bring this aspect to the forefront that Raghu is made to stay on even when the son sat on the throne. There is a fine description of the son on the throne and the father in the garden.[106] In due course Raghu passed away.[107] One day the king was in the garden in the company of the queen, and a garland fell from the sky on the body of the queen and at once she lost her life.[108] The king wails over his loss. This is a very pathetic piece, consisting of about thirty six verses.[109]

The queen was at first a celestial damsel, and she was sent to a Sage to shake him from his penance, by the Lord of the heaven; the sage was infuriated and he cursed her that she would become an ordinary women on earth; later the sage was slightly pacified and he indicated the end of the effect of the curse as the time when she would meet a celestial flower.[110] That is how the garland was the cause of her death. Some Gandharvas were going along the sky and a garland fell down from their hands. The family teacher of the kings, Vasishtha, sent this information through one of the disciples to Aja, to explain the situation and to console him.[111] There was a son born to him, [112] and the king continued to rule the country till the boy grew up.[113] As soon as the son came of age and was able to take up the burden of governing the country, Aja placed him on the throne[114] and went to the confluence of the river Sarayu with the river Ganges, and there he discarded his mortal body and went to heaven where he was able to meet his former queen; and united to her he continued to enjoy life in the beautiful mansions in the celestial gardens.[115] In the case of Dilipa we do not know anything about what happened to him after death. In the case of Raghu, he had the vision of the Supreme beyond the darkness; nothing more is said of him; but in the case of Aja it is definitely said that he went to heaven and continued the same life of happiness which he had enjoyed on earth. This touch also adds to the picture of the king destined to enjoy, as distinct from the two former kings. With the description of these three kings, one part of the great Epic ends, and this is a very happy end for an Epic. But the Epic as we have at present continues for another eleven Cantos, and I do not propose to proceed with the text any more, since this portion is sufficient for my thesis. KALIDASA describes three kings, presenting three distinct characters, united together in this aspect that they are all great men, and that they are great kings because they are all great men. There is no mention of any of the appendages that are usually associated with kings by other poets, in the description of any of the three kings.

I have taken up this one work of KALIDASA for special treatment when I took up the point of kings in KALIDASA in so far as this is the " Book of Kings " among KALIDASA's works. We find the same tone continued in all the works of KALIDASA where there is a king appearing, and as I have already said, kings form the most prominent raw material for the art of KALIDASA. In the *Śākuntala,* the scene is laid in the forest, in five[116] out of the seven Acts, and only two Acts have the palace as the scene. Even out of these two, one is the garden of the palace.[117] The king is alone without any retinue in the hermitage of a great sage; there was Sakuntala with her two companions to receive the king. This is the position in the first and in the third Acts. In the second Act the king is introduced in the forest in the neighbourhood of the same hermitage in the company of his close associate, the *Vidūṣaka.* The commander-in-chief is introduced simply to be dismissed as having no part in the plot of the drama. The fourth Act is also in the hermitage, but without the king. The last Act is in the hermitage of another great sage, where the king and Sakuntala come together again. In all these scenes we find an atmosphere of serene calmness, free from stiff formalities and ceremonies. But it is in the fifth Act that we find the scene changed over to the real palace, and here we find that there is a stiffness, some forms and ceremonies. The king is here introduced as a lifeless king, the only place really where we find a king as a king in his palace. This is to show the contrast of the king as a great man and the king as a mere king in the palace. The king in the palace becomes a mere decorated idol, subject to all the forms and ceremonies of the court, without any life, without any freedom. In the forest the hero in the *Śākuntala* is found to be a very pleasant man, simple in his ways, able to appreciate and even to take a joke. We like and we love the king in the forest; we are simply puzzled at the conduct of the same king in the palace, when he sits on the throne with his officials around him. We even pity the king when he had to sit in that uncomfortable place, after we had seen him in the free atmosphere of the forest and the hermitage, and we are able to have a sigh of relief when we see him again in another hermitage in the final Act of the drama.

In the traditional literary criticism, we find that all the kings in KALIDASA are grouped together as specimens of a single type of heroes termed *Dhīrodātta*, i. e., valient and powerful. The literary critics of ancient India drew up certain rules for the delineation of the charactor of the hero in a good Drama, and whether KALIDASA had dreamt of such rules or not, the aim of the literary critics was to show how the rules can be applied to all of them. This description of the kings in Sanskrit literature has been adopted by modern literary critics when they took up the examination of Sanskrit Literature, and they speak of the literature as centering round the kings in the palace.

In the works of KALIDASA we do not find kings on the throne but only great men, who had also to take up the responsibility of governing the country and of guiding the nation. It is the aspect of great men that is found dealt with in the works of KALIDASA, and there is only a casual mention that they are also kings. We see nothing of their pomp and their luxury in their palace. KALIDASA did not write the dramas and the poems to glorify the kings or any king in particular. His purpose was to show that a king can be great only if he is also a great man. We can understand KALIDASA only if we look into this human aspect in the types of kings that he introduces in his works.

THE COMMON PEOPLE AND WOMEN

It is for some special reasons that I had to select such a title, in which I had to combine the common people and women together into a single group for treatment. It is true that they are all citizens, and such a manner of grouping is not in keeping with the notion of human equality. If the Vedic tradition had continued in India, perhaps there would have been no occasion for such a special grouping. But the Vedic conditions were altered in India under some foreign influences, and women and the common people became separate entities in the nation, distinct from some other groups, the kings and their associates (usually designated the aristocrates) and their companions, the priests. In course of time they formed themselves into an "upper class", and as a result, the common people became the "lower class". Along with this change, women also began to be assigned a lower level in the national life. This is not a development from the Vedic tradition, but a revolt against the Vedic tradition. I have dealt with this point in greater detail in my lectures relating to the Vedic culture. In the poetry of KALIDASA we find clear traces of his desire to re-establish the Vedic tradition of equality among all the citizens, without the distinction of community and sex.

The way in which KALIDASA deals with the problem of the position of the common people and of women in the national life is something peculiar, something not found in any other literature in the world. In the literatures of what are called modern western languages, it is said that a particular kind of literary form has risen in which Nature and the so-called lower class common people, are assigned a very high place. In such literary forms we are told that the special interest centres round the life of the common people, the peasants, mostly with their simple life in their modest homes; the poets describe their poverty in external form, but a sort of richness in their real inner life as seen by a sympathetic poet; to such poets what is bare, what has no real life, is the sort of life led by the so-called upper classes with immense material wealth, living in the cities, wallowing in luxuries that make life unnatural. I have often heared the remark that in Sanskrit literature there is not found that kind of poetry in which such a sympathy is shown for the common people, in which the richness and beauty in the simple life of the common man in their villages and in their fields is brought out. But I must at this stage draw a distinction between the poets of modern West who are supposed to be sympathisers of the common people and the poets of ancient India like KALIDASA and VALMIKI and VEDAVYASA, who are supposed to have only glorified kings and gods and who completely neglected the common people.

Take for example, SHAKESPEARE, who is famous for the variety of characters whom he has introduced in his plays from all stations in life and from all conditions in life. I have already said in the previous lecture dealing with kings, that if kings are withdrawn as heros from the works of SHAKESPEARE, there remains little of what may be called SHAKESPEARE's drama. Most of the dramas have a king as hero. There is something more in the dramas of SHAKESPEARE; not only are his dramas full of kings, his dramas are also full of the associates of kings like Barons and Military chiefs. It may be that SHAKESPEARE deliniates kings in their universal form of human beings that would interest people of all times and all countries. I am not dealing with the characterisation in SHAKESPEARE; I am dealing with the characters that fill the stage in the dramas of SHAKESPEARE. The technique of characterisation is what only the few literary critics can understand and appreciate; it is the characters who appear on the stage that appeal to the generality of readers and to those who witness a play on the stage. To them SHAKESPEARE's plays deal with kings and their associates; the common people, when they appear on the stage, are inferior to the kings and their associates. In this way the distinction between kings and their associates on one side and the common people on the other side is there, well preserved, in the dramas of SHAKESPEARE. They are what I can truly designate "Court Dramas".

When we come to another great poet of English literature, say WORDSWORTH, it is true that we come to another region. We find simple folk in their modest homes and in the fields, poor and ragged; toiling hard with their hands, and subject to diseases and various kinds of sufferings. Here also, we find the simple folks of the country parts as something distinct from the "aristocrate" of the cities. I even admit that there is an attempt by such poets of the common people, to elevate them to a high level and to reveal the nobility and beauty in their life. But in such a description, we find the distinction of class and class kept up as a reality in this world; it is as much the contrast with the "aristocrats" as the inherent nobility of life that interests us in the poetry of WORDSWORTH, as I can see it. In this way, it is found that class distinction is an essential element in the literary genius of the West, whether the poet deals with common people as "aristocrats" or these "aristocrats" as common people. The aristocrate never shed their aristocratic form and colour, however much their internal nature as human beings may be emphasised in the actual deliniation. This is entirely different from the technique of the poets of India like VEDAVYASA and VALMIKI and KALIDASA.

There is still another point that we have to deal with, if we are to correctly understand and appreciate the poetry of ancient India. In the poetry of modern West, I find that the poets consider the readers merely as a sort of lifeless apparatus, say a telescope. They hold the reader on, fixed to a point, and the reader has no freedom to pass on to another point or to have a wider view of things. Then they may be shifting the focus to another point. But the poets hold the reader on for too long a period, and all sorts of details are presented to him. It may be a shepherd boy or it may be a ploughman or it may be a poor peddler. But the reader cannot escape from the descriptions of the minutest details of the object of the description for the time being. The reader misses a movement; he feels as if he is held up with a chain, or as if he is screwed down to a point. Until the poet releases the reader and fixes him on to another point, he finds himself in that position.

But in KALIDASA we find ourselves in quite another situation, He never takes hold of the reader; he never interferes with his freedom of movement. The poet considers the reader more like a camera; the poet just opens the aperture and the whole view in front is exposed to the view of the camera. It is just a moment's work. According to the light and shade, the camera remains in that position with the aperture open for shorter or longer periods, but never for a period that will result in blurring and spoiling the impression. To change the metaphor, the poet simply leads the reader to a wide field and tells him in which direction he has to focus his eyes to get a real view of the whole field. Every one who has an elementary notion of art knows that it is not possible for all to view and grasp the real beauty of a landscape; he wants the assistance of a true artist to guide him in the matter of selecting the angle of vision, to select the right environment like light and shade. The early dawn, the rising sun, the dark night, the bright moonlight: all such phenomena have different effects on a landscape, and each landscape must be seen in the right time with the right environment, if one is to see the true beauty of the scenery. The same is the case with a bird or an animal. They present a special beauty under special conditions; it is only an artist that can understand and present to others the particular environment for realising the true beauty of an object; and viewed from the right angle and under the right conditions every object has a beauty of its own.

KALIDASA never inflicts himself on the readers; he simply helps them. Unless we understand these points, we cannot realise the inherent beauty in the warks of KALIDASA. The standards applied for estimating the artistic values in SHAKESPEARE will not be applicable to the works of KALIDASA; nor will WORDSWORTH be a true guide for evaluating the artistic beauties in KALIDASA. KALIDASA must be judged by standards prepared from within the works of KALIDASA themselves. The Indian poets, KALIDASA, VEDAVYASA and VALMIKI have their own techniques.

KALIDASA never wrote a poem about kings as kings presenting them in a kingly situation with Barons and army chiefs and palaces; nor did he write a poem on the common people by themselves, presenting the nobility of their simple life and the beauty of their rustic surroundings. There is no poem either from the pen of KALIDASA where only the objects of Nature are described. KALIDASA wrote about the world. It is the unity among the "differents" in the world described by KALIDASA that gives it its true value as literature.

But unfortunately, KALIDASA is judged from the point of view of classical, formal criticism, with set standards, the attempt being to measure the poems with those set standards. Here the result has been that KALIDASA has been accepted as a really good poet, the tests being that he is found satisfactory, with the rules framed in advance for judging the literary values of a poem. The Hero and the Heroine satisfy the rules about their deliniation framed and presented in works on literary criticism; and the other characters in a drama do not count at all. This is classical criticism. Then the other method of criticism is what is applied to the study of SHAKESPEARE or WORDSWORTH; and here also, though the standards are drawn from the poetry itself, when they are applied to KALIDASA, they become as inappropriate as the standards of the classical school of literary criticism, being external to the poetry itself. That is why modern literary critics are not able to find the same interest in the works of KALIDASA which they see in Shakespeare or in Wordsworth.

Thus in studying the works of KALIDASA, to understand what KALIDASA has to say about the common people, we must understand that KALIDASA has neither kings in kingly envirenments nor peasants in the peasant's environments for the theme in his works. We see kings in the environments of Nature and we see also peasants brought into the same environments. In this way we have to study the peasants and other kinds of what are called the common people in the environments of Nature, face to face with kings and other kinds of "aristocrates". While Shakespeare has drawn upon history and semi-historical sources for his kings along with the associates of kings, KALIDASA takes only the kings from the history or semi-historical sources, and he takes all the other characters from his own imagination. In Wordsworth, we do not come across historical characters; we see only characters drawn from his own imaginations representative of the common people; or we see Nature.

Unless we understand the special technique of KALIDASA, we cannot realise the beauty in KALIDASA's work. KALIDASA is not interested in the kings who are famous in history; he is not also interested in the peasants as simple peasants. He brings the kings down from their throne and out of their palace, and presents them as great men; similarly, he elevates the peasants from their relatively humble places of poverty and suffering, and presents them also as great men. KALIDASA is not a worshipper of kings and their associates; nor is he a poet who tries to elevate poverty and suffering to the position of a fetish. He is a worshipper of greatness and nobility in men; he is a worshipper of artistic wealth and beauty in the world. He sees only great men in a world of beauty and artistic wealth, and in the world he sees only the enjoyment of such beauty and wealth by great and noble men. This is the technique in the poetry of the Vedas and also in the poetry of VEDAVYASA and of VALMIKI, which KALIDASA preserves and continues. I have already dealt with the kings drawn by KALIDASA from history. Now I take up the common people.

Here also, one cannot fail to notice a partiality on the part of KALIDASA for the womenfolk, among the common people. He lived in a certain environment, and no poet can completely extricate himself from his environment, though what he writes is essentially of a universal appeal. What a poet does is not to get out of his environment, but to present the universal aspects in the environments. Every environment has its aspect of universality, and also the aspect of that particular time and place. He lived in an environment of what may be called anti-femininism. The women were considered as the seat of sin and suffering, and association with women was condemned as what leads one away from the true path towards the goal of absolute happiness beyond the world and beyond of this life in the world. It is on account of this attitude towards women, on account of the fact that there is some inferiority attached to them, that I have put the common people and the women together into a single group for treatment. The common people were objects of derition, being low in social rank, and women were objects of derision, being the cause of sin and suffering for the superior men. Without this back-ground it is not possible to have a full appreciation of the treatment of the common people by KALIDASA in his works.

In contrast to the treatment of the common people in modern western poetry, we must understand that KALIDASA does not present before our eyes a row of common people in various conditions of life. Nor does he present to us a large number of kings with their associates, nor a large number of women. What KALIDASA does is to present to us the world with specimens of what he wants the common people to be, what he considers them to be, what their value is to the completion of the world, with a full life. We found that in the whole of the first eight Cantos of the *Raghuvaṁśa*, he had introduced only three kings and no associates of theirs. In the dramas, there is just one king in each and it is only in the *Śākuntala* and the *Vikramorvaśīya* that the son of the king also comes on the stage, and that quite at the end of the drama. The associates of the kings like ministers and army chiefs are conspecuous by their absence. This may be contrasted with the crowd of kings and barons and army chiefs that fill the stage in Shakespeare. I had to show what KALIDASA thought of kings with reference to a very small number of specimens, and in the case of the common people also we have to be content with a very small number. We must also remember that KALIDASA wrote his poetry at a time when the atmosphere was saturated with the Vedic doctrine, as taught in the Upanishads, that by seeing one piece of clay, one can understand all clays, and also with the dectrine of the "Universal" as taught in one system of Logic that the "Universal" can be grasped with a single observation.

But, when it is from the pen of a real artist, a few specimens are quite enough, and in the case of each picture, a very few touches give us a full and clear picture. I have already said that when the kings go out on a tour, he never goes out as a king but only as a great man, and when any one accompanies him or meets him it is never the usual associates of the king, but the common people. When the king is taken out of the confines of his palace, the people of the villages and the country-parts are also taken out of their humble environments and brought face to face with the kings, and they are described as really great people, worthy of our admiration. When the king was going to the hermitage of the teacher, it was the common people in the villages that met him and gave him as presents the remnants of their religious worship along with their blessings [2] and it was also the elderly cowherds who brought him as presents their dairy produce.[3] It is seldom that he mentions a city or a palace; when rarely he introduces a city or a palace there too he never brings in the usual associates of the palace, but only the common people who serve in the palace or who live in the city. Thus in the description of the kings of the Raghu dynasty,[4] there is the mention of the birth of a son to the first king in that Epic, and it is said that whenever the people serving in the palace brought him news of the birth of the son, which was like nectar to his ears, however much the same words may be repeated, he gave them rich presents, and only his unbrella, and the Chamara[5] fans, which were the emblems of his royalty, remained with him which he could not give away.[6] Here there is mention only of the common people in the palace. Similarly when the second king Raghu offered the student the money which he wanted for his education, he asked him to take far more than what he wanted for his immediate purpose and when the student refused to take anything more than what he needed for his immediate purpose, it was the common citizens of the Capital city who congratulated them both.[7] It is this silence, this snub given to the so-called Very Important People, that is so expressive of KALIDASA's love of the common folk and his great respect for them. In the *Śākuntala* also, there is one scene in the palace of the king, and there it is only the personal attender of the king, designated the *Kañcukī* (one who has a *Kañcuka* or livery) that is introduced.[8] During the March of Victory undertaken by Raghu,[9] KALIDASA speaks of the common soldiers who enjoyed the water of the cocoa-nut palms, drunk with the help of the betel leaves used as funnel when they have to pour the water straight into their mouths from the nut.[10] When the son of Raghu, Aja, went to the kingdom of Vidarbha for the wedding of the sister of the Vidarbha king, he took presents from the country people for his use during the journey and it is the country people that made all the arrangements for his stay during the journey.[11]

In the *Kumārasambhava*, there is a long description of the Himalayas in the very beginning of the epic,[12] and here KALIDASA speaks of the forest-dwellers who live in the caves of the mountains, and who enjoy the mild glow from some herbs which shed some light even within the caves, as a night lamp without having the trouble of filling the lamps with oil.[13] The hunters were able to discover the path of the lions whom they were chasing, from the pearls dropped down from the nails of the lions who had killed the elephants since the pearls from the forehead of the elephants had struck between the nails of the lions.[14] This is a poetic convention even during the time of KALIDASA, that on the forehead of the elephants there are pearls and that when the lions kill the elephants the pearls drop down from the forehead and get stuck between the nails of the lions.

In the *Meghadūta*, the cloud is described always as a common man and the mountains are his friends;[15] the birds and the animals too are his companions during his journey.[16] Never is the cloud described as a great king, nor as a "Very Important Person" to be associated with the kings. In the Drama, *Mālavikāgnimitra*, there are the two dancing masters who form the most important persons in the first half of the drama.[17] From all these things it would be found that KALIDASA introduces the common people in his poems as important characters, while he is silent about the "Very Important People" associated with the kings.

KALIDASA has no sympathy with the poverty and suffering of the common people. He is not what is termed a realist in art; he depicts the world which *he* sees, what he wants the world to be, rather than what the bare world is. Sufferings and toils are accidents in this world and not what *should* be preserved. He finds in the people of the country parts, only specimens of noble people worthy of honour and admiration.

It may be said that in the three dramas and in the three poems, two of which are epics, there are only very few characters appearing whom we can bring under the common people. The fact is that KALIDASA describes only some specimens, and he does not bring a large number of them on the scene. Further, KALIDASA is essentially a poet of Nature, and when it comes to the question of describing Nature, it will be found that we are presented with a large number of scenes with a variety of the objects of Nature in them. As for men, they are only decorations in his poetry and not the real theme. In a drama and in an epic, there must be some story, and a story can be narrated only around some human beings. Thus the people appear in the poetry of KALIDASA as incidental to the technique of poetry, as a necessity to make it the narration of some incidents. Such characters enable KALIDASA to introduce an element of movement in his poetry. This explains the small number of characters that appear in the poetry of KALIDASA, and whether it is the kings or the common people the number is comparatively small indeed.

But when we come to women characters in his poetry, it will be found that they are relatively large in number. In the matter of the actual number of characters, men may predominate women; but the women play a more prominent role when it comes to a question of incidental references to people during the narration of a story. Thus, throughout the narrations of stories, he introduces women characters through incidental mentions. I have already hinted at the reason for this partiality for women in the poetry of KALIDASA in relation to men. It is because of the degradation to which women had been condemned at a certain stage in the development of Indian culture, being condemned as abodes of sin and as causes of suffering in this world.

But before I take up the question of women, I have to dispose of another point, very closely related to women; and that is the question of children in KALIDASA. It is rather surprising that KALIDASA does not describe children very much. In the whole of the *Raghuvaṁśa,* there is only the description of Raghu as an infant. Dilipa comes in only as a reigning king and not even as a boy. The third King, Aja, is not described as an infant. But there is a brief, yet beautiful, description of Raghu as a little baby. And even this is only in two verses. And the two verses are enough to give a picture of the infant for more graphic than what an inferior poet could do in a dozen verses. "The infant repeated the words first uttered by the governess; he gently walked holding her fingers; when the governess taught him how to show respect to others, he bowed down. By this the father's delight was increased".[18] "On placing the baby on his lap, the father felt as though, through the delight of such touch of the limbs, the baby was sprinkling nectar on his skin; he closed his eyes and in this way enjoyed the pleasure of the touch of the son for a long time".[19] There is a long description of the joy in the palace on account of the birth of a son; [20] but the son is himself introduced only in a very brief way. KALIDASA seldom handles the story in such a way as to give him an occasion to describe a baby in any detail. In the two dramas, the *Śākuntala* and the *Vikramorvaśīya,* the king's son is introduced at a very late stage in the development of the plot, and at that time, they had become boy heroes, leaving off the stage of infants. In the *Mālavikāgnimitra,* the hero's son is mentioned as leading an army against the Yavanas. In the *Kumārasambhava,* it would have been the easiest thing for KALIDASA to describe the stage of Parvati as a baby; but the description[21] is about the grown up girl and not of the baby. We find young boy heroes; we find young girls coming up to their youth. But of babies we find little in the poems of KALIDASA. I cannot find any explanation. We find women as heroines in stories and not as mothers, fondling babies. I am not at all asserting that there is no prominence given in the works of KALIDASA to filial love. It is only babies that are not described; there is a profusion of description of boys and girls and of the love of the parents to such children. KALIDASA gives full expression to the joy produced by the touch of little babies in the parents. Thus there is the statement in the *Śākuntala*: "Blssed are they who can get themselves besmeared by the dust from the limbs of their sons when they carry such sons who love to sit on their laps, whose bud-like teeth become just visible as they smile with no provocation, and who try to lisp some words which become fascinating through their indistinct syllables".[22] The boy in the context is not a baby; he has become a boy hero; yet the father is imagining within himself the joy of the parents if they could enjoy the touch of a baby son.

KALIDASA introduces old men; he introduces also young men and young women. But it is not often that we find a baby introduced by KALIDASA in his works, and even when there are occasions, he misses them, as in the case of Parvati in the *Kumārasambhava*. It is only in the case of Raghu that I have seen a real description of a baby, and that is relatively very brief. We see loving parents; but we do not see the parents fondling a bay. There are two really good occasions where I expected KALIDASA to deal with the babyhood of the characters; one of them is the daughter of Himavan in the *Kumārasambhava* and the other is the son of Raghu, who is to become a worthy bride-groom, in his *Raghuvaṁśa*. KALIDASA's personal preference is for heroic men, and also for young women. His handling of boys and girls is only a preparation for the presentation of such heroes and young women.

KALIDASA never misses a chance to say something about women in his poems. In the poetry of KALIDASA, Nature occupies the most prominent position, and then comes women; after that we see the heroes, really heroic men. Thus in the hermitage of the family teacher of the king in the first Canto of the *Rāghuvaṁśa*, we see the antilopes blocking the passage of the wives of the *Ṛiṣis* (sages) at the entrance to the hermitage,[23] and the young women water the trees in the hermitage.[24] When Raghu, the son of this first king, is described, KALIDASA mentions the young girls watching the rice-fields, sitting in the thick shades of the sugar-canes planted along the border of the fields and singing the anecdotes about the young king starting from his boyhood.[25] Here there is something more that is worthy of observation. It cannot be seen quite clearly in a translation. The king is referred to as the protector of the people, and the girls who watch the rice-fields are referred to as the protecresses of the rice. The word used is the same, *Goptar*. Here it is only when we read the text in Sanskrit, that we can see what KALIDASA had in view, namely, that the girls are the equals of the king, both being "protectors". It is just like the superiority of the elders of the cowherd settlements above the king that was hinted in an earlier context.[26] KALIDASA knows that his readers have imagination and that they can see a whole landscape when their attention is drawn to it, if he simply shows the direction in which one has to look for the best effect.

When during the March of Victary, Raghu reaches the Kerala country, he speaks of the Kerala women who had cast off their ornaments out of fear; and on the parting of their hair, the dust from the army when they were marching, was deposited as a substitute for the toilet powder.[27] I must state here that however much KALIDASA knew the customs and manners of the various parts of the country, here he has missed the mark; the women in Kerala were never known to use any coloured powder for decorating the parting of their hairs.

When Raghu reached the country of Persia, the young girls there were deprived of their chance to drink wine by his unexpected arrival;[28] the idea is that the young men were drawn out for the battle with the army of Raghu and the girls had no companions to drink wine. Then Raghu went further to the north to the country of the Huns and there he speaks about the Huna women who beat their cheeks out of grief and anger at Raghu's conduct of heroism exhibited against their own husbands.[29] The women were full of wrath and grief at the death of their husbands in the battle against Raghu and they beat their cheeks as an expression of their feelings.

In this way, wherever Raghu goes, it is the women of the regions that KALIDASA refers, and practically never has he a word to say about the men folk, except of the soldiers who had to face Raghu during the march. Mostly it is about the Nature in such regions that KALIDASA describes, and this matter will be clear in another section of this treatment of the subject. KALIDASA's preferences have to be known as much from the actual references as from his silence about others when there is a chance. Thus the importance that KALIDASA attaches is brought out more by the silence about the usual associates of the kings during their descrptions than by the actual introduction of the common people and of women.

In the dramas of KALIDASA it will be found that the most interesting characters are the minor characters, and among them the young ladies attract our attention more than any other characters in the dramas. Thus in the *Śākuntala*, it is the two girl companions of the heroine more than any other character in the drama that interest us when we read it, They supply the motive force for the plot to evolve. The hero and the heroine are only prominent before our eyes; but in our mind we feel the influence that the two girl companions exert in allowing the story to move forward, and the hero and the heroine simply move on in the current without any activity, without any initiative, without any resourcefulness on their part. The course of the current and the speed of the current are determined by the two companions of the heroine. It is true that both of them disappear after the middle of the drama, and yet when they go off the stage, it is their words that determine the future course of events in the remainder of the story,[30] They dominate the scene even when the hero and the heroine are present, and the latter simply accepts what the companions decide.

It is a fact that the hero in the *Mālavikāgnimitra* is something unique in Sanskrit dramas; he has an individuality, and he is full of initiative and full of activity and he has plenty of resourcefulness also. Yet it is not he that supplies the motive force for the development of the plot. There is a Buddhist Nun, a former companion of the heroine, living in the palace incognite, but known to the heroine who too was living in the palace incognite. They knew each other's identity. There is also a new companion of the heroine, another very intelligent and interesting girl. The whole scheme in the plot is worked out by these two women characters to bring about the meeting of the hero and the heroine, in the drama. They surpass all the other characters, including the king and the queen and also the heroine. If I am asked to select the best two characters in the works of KALIDASA, I have no hesitation to assert that they are the two women characters, Priyamvada the companion of Sakuntala and Bakulavalika the companion of Malavika. KALIDASA has shown the importance of the women characters in his drama by selecting the name of the heroine for the title of the drama, sometimes adding the name of the hero also; and this when the hero is also full of initiative and resoursefulness, namely, in the *Mālavikāgnimitra*. In the other two dramas, KALIDASA introduces only the heroine in the title of the drama, along with the chief point in the plot, like the Ring in the *Śākuntala* and the valour in the case of the *Vikramorvaśīya*. The names of Dusshanta in the *Śākuntala* and of Pururavas in the *Vikramorvaśīya* are not mentioned in the titles of the dramas.

In the Epic, *Kumārasambhava*, there is the description of the arrival of Siva as a bridegroom at the wedding of Parvati, the daughter of the mountain Himavan.[31] Here the women of the city assemble to see the arrival of the hero for the occasion, and naturally the women are more curious to see the bride-groom arriving than the men folk in the city. This description of the way in which the women hurry to the window to have a look at the bride-groom has been taken over in the *Raghuvaṁśa* also on the occasion of the wedding of Indumati, where Aja, the bride-groom arrives with the bride for the ceremony of the wedding, after the formal choice of the husband by the bride.[32] Here we find the partiality which KALIDASA exhibts for women in his poetry.

This is a description which a later poet named ASVAGHOSHA has imitated in his poem on the "Life of Buddha", in which when Buddha goes out in the city, people go to the street with eagerness to have a view of him. In a canto in the *Raghuvaṁśa*[33] itself, the description of the behaviour of the kings assembled for the wedding of the Princess on seeing the bride, is also possibly an imitation of this same scene[34] interpolated by an inferior poet. Anyway the description is charming in the *Kumārasambhava* and in the *Raghuvaṁśa*, and I cite it below.

At that moment there occurred in the rows of mansions, the behaviour of the women of the city, who were very eager to have a view of Siva and who left off all other matters to be attended to.[35]

In the case of one woman who was hurrying to the window outside, the braided hair on the head even at the point of being held together with the hands, was not attended to for being tied up, in so far as the garland for tying up was let off and the flowers were scattered on the floor.[36]

Another women shook off the feet that had been taken hold of by her valet and that had already been decorated, the paint being still wet, and abandoning her usual slow gait, she made the whole floor up to the window coloured by that paint,[37]

Still another woman attended to her right eye with the black, and depriving the left one of it, went to the side of the window even in that way, with the casket of black in her hand.[38]

And still another, casting her eyes out through the window, did not fix the end of her clothe that had become loose when she started; but she held up the clothe with her hands and allowed the bangles to glitter on her exposed navel.[3]

In the case of another, the waist-band was being strung with gems and when it was half finished, she got up from her seat in a hurry and the gems started falling off which she could not hold together, and by the time she reached the window, the string with one end tied up to her toe alone remained.[40]

In the case of all such women, when their faces fragrant with wine filled the entire space within the windows, the windows appeared as if decorated with lotus flowers, and thair eyes looked like bees on such lotus flowers.[41]

Those women drinking freely with their eyes the charms of him who was the sole object to be seen at that moment, did not look at any other object ; in this way, the functions of all the other senses looked like having entered the eyes.[42]

The women who assembled at the windows of their homes in the streets of the city express their admiration of the beauty of the wedding couple also ; "If this pair had not been united together, with their charms each worthy of being coveted by the other, the effort of the creator in bestowing beauty on both of them would have been fruitless."[43] This is a free rendering of what they were remarking to one another when they saw the couple coming. Here is a specimen of the women of the higher strata of society as painted by KALIDASA. But the true description of women in KALIDASA is to be found in his *Meghadūta*, which is his real lyric about women. Practically from the beginning to the end of the description of the route to be followed by the cloud to reach the home of the heroine, we come across references to women in various conditions. The cloud becomes really a women's man, the object of admiration for the women in the country parts.

When the cloud is to start from that place where the hero met him, the hero tells him ; "When you rise up to the path of the winds the women whose husbands have gone out on journeys will be looking at you with great relief through confidence, holding up the ends of their hair falling on their forehead; for, who will dare to ignore their wives immersed in sarrow at their separation, when you are ready to start ? I am sure there will be no other man like me whose movements are subject to the will of others."[44] Here we find the cloud as a friend and consoler of the women separated from their husbands and eager aboat a re-union.

"Being drunk by the eyes of the women in the country parts, who are not trained in shaking their eye-brows, because the fruit of their cultivation is dependent on you, but whose eyes at the same time are full of affection and love, you rise up from the fields and take a turn to the west and then move forward to the north."[45]

Here we find the cloud as an object of admiration and intense love of the country women who are full of affection but who do not know how to exhibit that affection through devices like shaking their eye-brows. KALIDASA likes the plain and unaffected look of the country women far better than the artifices of the trained women of the cities. After passing some hills and the river Nurmada, the cloud would reach the river Vetravati near the city of Vidisa, which is an Imperial Capital famous in the whole world,[46] and the cloud would be able to drink some water from that river. This is pictured as a kiss with the possibility of drinking the lips of a heroine. "It is worthy of enjoyment on account of the sound of the birds from the near-by banks, which will be like the whisper of a girl; so you drink the tasty water from that river like drinking the lips of a girl; the gently shaking ripples will be like the movements of the eye-brows".[47] Near by there is a hill called Nichaih. There are some caves in that hill and within the caves are slabs of stones which will proclaim the youthful vigour of the citizens when the fragrance within will indicate their enjoyment in the company of women, whose company can easily be bought with money."[48] "In that region where there are vast jasmine gardens, you will be able to make the acquaintance of the women who would be collecting flowers from the fields, and who allow the flowers worn as decorations to fade when they try to forcibly wipe off the perspiration from their cheeks, if only you can give them some shade for a short while."[49] Here it must be noted that there is no other point on the route about which KALIDASA gives such a detailed description,[50] and that shows KALIDASA's partiality for this place. And that is the place where Agnimitra had his Capital and where is laid the scene of the drama *Mālavikāgnimitra*.

At this stage comes a long description of the city of Ujjayini;[51] this long description can be explained on account of the celebrity of the city in the whole country at that time. The hero tells the cloud that though he has to go out of his direct route, yet it is worthwhile to turn a little to the West and reach Ujjayini before he goes further to the North.[52]

There are twelve verses devoted to this description, which is nearly one-fifth of the first part, and in so far as the description of the route starts only after the first fifteen verses, it is fully a fourth of the description of the route.

In this description there is no mention of the king or his palace. It is essentially a description of the life of the women in the city. In so far as there is no real description of the city as a city, and since we know that the scene is in a city only from the mention of the name, we feel only the description of women and not the description of the city women.

The very introductory verse refers to the women of the city. The reason why the hero insists on the cloud paying a visit to Ujjayini, even though the city is out of the way, is that "if you do not enjoy the delight of seeing the women of the city whose eyes would become timid on account of the flash of the lightning from you, the ends of their eyes moving gently, then, you would be betraying your own eyes."[53] Thus, to see the women of Ujjayini is the real purpose of a visit to the city.

On his way to Ujjayini from that point, the cloud would see the river named Nirvindhya, and this is another gain which the cloud would have by deviating from the direct route, to go to Ujjayini. "In that river a row of birds would be sitting on the gently shaking waves, and when the birds make a slow sound, it would look like the waist band of a women that makes a jingling sound; the movement of the river is uneven and as such doubly lovable; some ripples appear to be her navel that is exposed; on your way, you fill yourself with some water from that river, which will be like drinking the lips, going down a little to that river, and remain in her path. The signs of a slight mental confusion noted above must be taken as a full expression of the reciprocation of your love by her."[54]

"When you approach that river, the flow of water would have dwindled down into just a narrow line; her colour would be pale on account of the decaying leaves that would be falling on the river; on account of these marks of the sorrow of separation, she will fully exhibit your fortune by being such an object of her love. That process whereby she would be freed from her slenderness, can be accomplished only by you."[55]

After this enjoyment of the company of the river, the cloud would be reaching the great city of Ujjayini in the country called Avanti.

"In this city, the breeze from the river Sipra removes the fatigue of the women during their conjugal enjoyment like a real lover, who responds to her invitations with great readiness."[56] "The cloud can spend a night in the mansions where the floor becomes red on account of the paints from the feet of the charming women[57] or on the edges of houses where the hen-*Pārāvata* birds will be also sleeping".[58] The wind will be blowing from the river in which the young ladies would have enjoyed their water sports and as such the wind will be full of fragrance".[59] "The fascinating young women there would cast on you their glances long as a row of bees, when they receive from you drops of rain that would be soothing to the wounds on their bodies inflicted during conjugal enjoyments; when they take their steps the waist bands would be making a sound; their hands would be tired on account of the *Çāmara* fans which they would have been waving with trained ease and which would be glittering with gems set in rows in their middle."[60] "Young ladies would be walking along the streets in the city at night, that are shrouded in darkness so thick that one can pierce it with a needle, and as such it is impossible to see anything; they would be going to the residences of their lovers; at that time you may make a flash of your lightning like a piece of gold drawn on a touch-stone; but do not make a thundering noise or pour down any rain since they are all very timid."[61] "There is the river by name Gambhira; its water is as clear as mind. You can get entry into that in the form of your reflection. You are by nature fortunate in the matter of the love of women. That river will cast a glance of love at you with her eyes in the form of the fish moving briskly within. You shall not be too serious and reject her invitations."[62] "You may come down and rest yourself over her; the dark waters in her are like her clothes, and there are the water-reeds falling into the waters and it will appear that she is removing her clothes with her hands. Gently her clothes will be moved from her waist, namely, the banks. Even in that condition, you must be able to proceed further. I know what a painful thing it is to leave off a woman, whose company you have enjoyed previously and who has exposed her waist on this occasion."[63]

Here ends the description of the city of Ujjayini and also the major part of the description of the route; after this there is the mention of a hill and the temple of Subrahmanya on the top of it.[64] Then, although there is a vast stretch of the country till one reaches the Himalayas, little is said about the details of the region. In this description of the route, there is no mention of men assembling to see the cloud. There is no mention of a king. The whole description is taken up practically by the women; there are the women who were expecting their husbands returning from their journeys, women who were happy about the prospects of agriculture since the cloud was appearing, women who were gathering flowers in the gardens, women who gave joy to the youthful citizens, women who were dancing in temples at Ujjayini and women who were going along the streets at night to meet their lovers. Further, the rivers on the way are also described as women, the beloved of the cloud.

KALIDASA is essentially a poet of women, and the *Meghadūta* is especially a Lyric about women and their love. Does it mean that he was writing poetry on themes that are vulgar, low and common-place, that he was a worshipper of the crude and carnal aspects of life, that he was an advocate of the voluptuous life among men? Not at all. There is a reticence, a calmness and a reserve in his descriptions that can completely wipe out all shades of what are vulgar and lowly. Art is not concerned with the *matter*; art is concerned with the *manner*. There is nothing that cannot form the theme in art. KALIDASA takes up certain common things in life and produces a high type of art from them. He took up the kings as heroes and he gave greater importance to women, on account of the environments in which he found himself. In the poetry of KALIDASA, there is only beauty; there are no kings, there are no women also. His poetry would have been equally beautiful, equally great, if he had described kings as kings on the throne in a palace or if he had described men. He took the matter from the environments and he created his art from within himself.

There are two kinds of beauty; one is the beauty of the common man and there is the beauty of the artist. So far as the beauty known to the common man is concerned, it has been the experience throughout the history of man that women are capable of creating this beauty better than men, and there is beauty in a feminine form superior to what is found in men. If women are condemned as abodes of sin and as the source of suffering in man's life and as an obstacle in the path of men towards their final goal, man is forfeiting the major part of what he can enjoy as beauty in life. It is perhaps for this reason that KALIDASA took up women more prominently than men in his poetry. Farther, kings lose a good part of their joy in life by confining themselves to the palaces and to the company of their usual associates, and he wanted also to show what a joy they can derive by contact with Nature and with the common people.

KALIDASA is not a dry realist who describes the gross facts visible to the eyes of the common people; nor is he a mere mystic who cannot see the things around and who confines his attention to certain transcendental realities behind the gross matter. KALIDASA sees beauty in matter, which beauty transcends the gross matter and which at the same time exists in the matter. The beauty can be seen only in the matter and through the matter.

In my next talk, I will have to deal with the ideal of beauty found in the works of KALIDASA and this beauty he presents as existing in feminine forms. One cannot understand the point of view of KALIDASA unless he knows what feminine beauty is, and that is the reason why I had to deal with this point in such detail, before taking up the question of beauty in the works of KALIDASA.

IDAEL OF BEAUTY.

KALIDASA is a great poet; as such he is also a great literary critic. No poet can be great unless he knows his own art also. We have to judge the part of a poet from what the poet himself has indicated in his poetry about what his poetry is as conceived by him. This is not the place to enter into a detailed discussion on the various problems relating to art, relating to aesthetics. And many of the points that are usually taken up for discussion dealing with aesthetics, cannot be even introduced here. But other points will naturally come in. Is beauty a fact in this world, or only the projection of the mind of the artist when the mind of the artist is brought into contact with things? Is there a possibility of dividing the things of this world as beautiful and ugly? Are there any actual standards for such a division? Some of such points cannot be kept aloof from the consideration of the problem of what KALIDASA thought of beauty.

Our material for studying the question of the canons of literary criticism in the Vedic age is very limited. We know that they had some very definite conception of poetic art; this is quite plain from the available text of the Vedas. But a time came in India itself, when the Vedas ceased to be studied as specimens of literary art, when the Vedas were accepted only as part of ritualism. Then there arose the distinction between the realm of the Vedas and the realm of art. The Vedas brought happiness to man through ritualism; the artist too brought happiness to man through art. They came into a relation of antethesis. This is what we find in the earliest exposition of the theory of art preserved in a work called the *Nāṭyaśāstra* of BHARATA.

In this work BHARATA says that his book is a sort of rival to the Vedas. In his own view, his work is greater than the Vedas. He calls his work a new Veda.[1] In his time, the theory took deep root in the minds of the people that the Vedas deal with *Dharma*. (i.e. moral law) that there is a distinction between *Dharma* and *Adharma* (what is opposed to moral law) and that there is a distinction between those who are attached to the Vedas and to *Dharma* and those who are outside of it. When we study BHARATA, we must understand the method adopted by the authors in his time for discussing certain preliminary issues in their works. They did not write an *Introduction* as the authors do in modern times. They start the work with some assembly where one is superior to the others and one of the assembly asks that superior person to explain to them some specific subject. This is what we find in the *Nāṭyaśāstra* of BHARATA and this is what is found in the *Manusmṛti*. Here the *Ṛṣis* (Sages) assembled asked BHARATA to explain to them the science of dramas,[2] and BHARATA tells them that Brahma himself had written such a work[3] which he studied under orders from the author.[4] Then he explains some incidents relating to the work. When the work was written and when Brahma asked BHARATA to stage a drama according to the rules contained in his work, the opponents of the gods tried to bring obstacles to the performance, in so far as that has become a monoply of the gods, from which their opponents were excluded. It is just the Veda, they complained, which is specially meant for the propitiation of the Gods.[5] Then Brahma told the enemies of the gods that the new Veda that he had created was quite different from the old Veda.[6] According to the old Veda there is a distinction between *Dharma* and *Adharma*, and the Vedas were meant for the propitiation of the gods. In the new Veda in the form of dramaturgy, it is not merely a treatise on *Dharma*. In this new Veda there is scope for both *Dharma* and *Adharma*. There is a definite statement that "in this there is sometimes *Dharma*, sometimes Sport, sometimes Active Life and sometimes Serene Calmness; sometimes there is Laughter, sometimes Fight, there is sometimes Love, sometimes Death." [7]

This pacifies the enemies of the gods. I cannot enter into an elaborate discussion on the point. But the theory meant to be substantiated here is that while in the Veda, there is a permanent division of things into good and bad, here there is no such division; all are good for art, whether they are good or bad in religion and in the Veda which determines the scope of the religion. What may be prohibited as bad by the Veda becomes quite acceptable for an artist. The artist's creation is quite different from the creation of the creator.

This theory of the existence of two worlds, one world created by the creator and the other by the artist, continued to play a very important role in the course of literary criticism in India, and such a late writer on the science of literary criticism as MAMMATA who wrote the standard text called the *Kāvyaprakāśa* says: "There remains in an eminent position the words of the poets that create a world which is free from the restrictions of Fate, where there is only joy and happiness. from which all disabilities of dependence are removed, where there are nine *Rasas*[8] that give delight."[9] In Sanskrit the word *Rasa* means both taste, which according to Indian enumeration are six, and also the emotions, which according to Indian Literary criticism are nine in number. This indicates also the superiority of the world created by a poet in relation to the world created by the creator. DANDIN, an earlier author on literary criticism[10] says that unless there had been the illumination in the world in the form of the words of poets, the entire world would have been immersed in darkness.[11] ANANDAVARDHANA, who came after DANDIN and before MAMMATA, also speaks about the superiority of the words of the poet in relation to the ordinary use of words in the world.[12] Thus the view about the superiority of the poet in relation to the creator has been persisting in the course of the literary criticism in India. The presentation of the world as it is, to the people, is never the business of the poet. The work of a poet is to present a world as he creates it from within his own imagination.

This view of literature is found in the works of KALIDASA. In the first verse in the *Raghuvaṁśa*, he gives an idea of the theory when KALIDASA prays to God for favouring him with poetic talents. The verse is: "I salute Parvati and Paramesvara,[13] the parents of the universe united to each other like word and meaning, in order that I may eommand words and meanings." Here the description of Siva and Parvati as the perents of the universe has no other purpose in the context than to show that the poet himself proposes to create a new world of his own with his poetry. Just as Siva and Parvati are the parents of the world, he wanted the words and meanings that he proposes to make use of, to be the parents of another universe. And this other universe is the poet's universe. There is no indication here that the poet's universe is superior to the world created by the creator. Here we find only an equality between the two. There is an indication that the poet's world is not the actual world created by the creator. There are certain theories of literary criticism suggested here. But I do not propose to take them up for any detailed examination at this stage. Is the cause of the world Matter of Spirit ? Of the two, Siva and Parvati, who are the parents of the world, Siva in the masculine represents the Spirit aspect and Parvati in the feminine represents the Matter aspect. They are so united to each other that we cannot distinguish them from each another. That is the *Ardhanārīśvara*[14] conception of the divinity. God is half male and half female, half Matter and half Spirit. Similarly, poetry is neither word nor meaning. It is both ; they are not different from each other. There is the matter in poetry and there is the form in poetry. Poetry must have both. KALIDASA prays to Siva and Parvati to favour him with a combination of word and meaning. Proper meaning in proper word form, is what is wanted to make poetry. Here there is an indication that there are certain themes that are suitable for poetry, and such themes must be put in suitable language form. That is what is called poetry. The idea that any theme is suitable for true poetry and that a true poet can give a poetic form to any theme in language, is not found here. Here it is found that the theme is as important as the language for poetry.

Perhaps the same theory is expressed in the fourth verse in the beginning of the same poem. It is: "Or, my passage through this dynasty, that has been properly bored in the form of words by ancient poets, is like the passage of a thread through a gem that has already been bored with a drill."[15] A diamond-cutter makes a hole in a diamond, and then a thread can easily pass through that hole; similarly the poets of ancient times have cleared the passage for him through this dynasty in the form of their own poetic compositions, and he has only to pass through that path. Here it is suggested that the theme for the poetry which KALIDASA proposed to write has been supplied by ancient poets; what he himself was doing was to give it an artistic form. Diamonds strung with a thread in any form will not give an appearance of beauty. There must be some art in such stringing. But anything cannot be strung into an artistic ornament; the substance too must be suitable for art. What he had in his hand as received from the ancient poets who have written narrations about the dynasty, was a suitable subject for his art; but that in itself is not art. There must be an artist to give that suitable matter some artistic form. Art is the presentation of a suitable material in a suitable form. It is this that KALIDASA has achieved in his epic poem, which was not in the original from which he took the material.

Beauty lies in the form, and poetic beauty lies in the language form which the poet gives to the theme that he takes up. As between the two elements in poetry, namely, the matter and the language form, the chief thing is the form which the poet adds to it. But there is an importance in the matter also. This aspect of literary criticism, what constituted poetry, whether it is the matter or whether it is the form or whether it a combination of both, played a very prominent part in the course of literary criticism in India. The generally accepted view is that poetry is matter *in* form, rather, matter *and* form. There are some qualifications; there must be some merits in the matter and in the form, and both must be free from defects, and there must be also some embellishments in both of them, Thus the formal school of literary criticism included the six elements in their works on literary criticism, namely, the merits and defects of matter, the merits and the defects of form, and the embellishments in matter and in form. It is a combination of the six elements that constituted poetic beauty, namely the presence of merits and embellishments in matter and form and the absence of defects in matter and form. In the *Raghuvaṁśa* we find that KALIDASA had accepted the same view, although we do not find any mention of defects and embellishments, in the words of KALIDASA. But it can be understood that when KALIDASA indicated the suitable matter, he must have thought of matter without defects and with merits; and when he utilised the matter in his poetic art, he must be adding the embellishments. The three sides of the form, is his own creation. Thus the six parts of what can be called poetic beauty is involved in what KALIDASA has said in the beginning of his *Raghuvaṁśa.*

But KALIDASA's notion of poetic beauty cannot be stopped here. He has much more to say in the other works which he has written. The question arises what beauty is. Beauty is what attracts our attention as giving a pleasurable sensation. In the Dynasty of the Raghus of which he proposed to write an epic, there were certain merits[16] which attracted his attention and persuaded him to write the epic; [17] and in this way, he found beauty in the story of the kings of the Dynasty of Raghu, of which earlier poets had also written poetry. But KALIDASA has something more to say about what real beauty is. Beauty to KALIDASA is not merely what attracts the attention of a person as giving pleasurable sensation, but what transfered such a quality to other things through association, which in themselves do not have that quality. It is not enough if a thing gave a pleasurable sensation; things associated with it also must have such a quality developed in them on account of such an association. Things may be ugly, that is, may give even a repulsive sensation. Even such things must acquire a beauty through association with a thing; only such things are really beautiful. This is what is very prominently found in the works of KALIDASA. Here he seems to indicate that even what are normally known as ugly things in the world can become beautiful through association with a real artist.

The Epic *Kumārasambhava* starts with a long description of the mountain Himalayas, conceived as a divinity and as a king of the mountains. The first verse is: " In the northern region there is a King of the Mountains named Himalayas, divine in nature." Then in the course of the description it is said: "The snow in that mountain that is the source of infinite gems and wealth, did not become a cause for the dimunition of its attractiveness; indeed, one defect, when it falls in with merits, merges in them, like the stain on the moon." [19] Here the commentators usually take the passage to mean that when there is a heap of good elements, one defect will be overcome by that heap and will not be noticed as a defect. At first that is the meaning that strikes one who reads the passage in a casual way. In the first part it was said that the defect in the form of snow did not take away the attractiveness of the mountain. Really, the second part is not a substantiation of what is contained in the first part. It contradicts the assumption contained in the first part. The assumption is that the defect wlll be prejudicial to the attractive nature. What the second part asserts is that, on the other hand, what was at first taken to be a defect adds to the beauty of the seat of that defect when there is a heap of good qualities in it. That is the force of the word "indeed". "Indeed" means "on the other hand, as a matter of fact". This has to be understood from the context. No poet in India considered the stain on the disk of the moon as a defect; really in the eyes of the poets, the stain added to the beauty of the disk of the moon. If the moon had been a plain flat disk with lustre, it would not have attracted the imagination of the poets. There is more said about the stain on the disk of the moon by the poets than about the moon itself. The stain is beautiful when it is on the moon, and it is the beauty of the moon that gives this beauty to the stain. But the moon by itself may not be really beautiful if it did not have this stain also; a plain, glittering disk may not have appealed to the poets in the same way in which the moon with its stain now attracts the poets. Thus, it is not possible to divide the things in this world into what are beautiful and what are not beautiful. It is the environment and the association that makes a thing beautiful or otherwise. The nature of beauty is that it gives beauty to such things which by themselves are not considered beautiful.

It is this idea that is expressed in a clearer way by KALIDASA when he described Sakuntala, who was living in the forest with barks of trees to wear as clothes. When the hero visits the hermitage in the forest, he sees the heroine there, clad in tree barks, and the hero remarks: "A lotus is attractive even when it is surrounded with moss; the mark on the moon, though in the form of a stain, brings beauty to it; this pretty girl is more charming even with the bark of trees as robes. What is there which does not become an ornament to a sweet form?"[19] The whole verse must be taken as a unit. It is the beauty of the moon that brings a beauty to the stain, and that stain, being thus beautiful, adds to the beauty of the moon as a decoration. This idea must be taken along with what is said about the moon and its stain in the *Kumārasambhava*, as already said above. The same is the case with the lotus in a heap of moss around it. And Sakuntala has an added beauty when she wears the tree-barks as robes. What adds beauty is an ornament. Things normally considered ugly become beautiful when they are brought into association with what are really beautiful, and then they become an ornament and add to the beauty of what gave beauty to itself. This is the mystery about beauty. It bestows beauty on what are not in themselves beautiful, and then it derives an added beauty from that on which a beauty was bestowed by it.

This is expressed in another place by KALIDASA when he describes the heroine in the *Vikramorvaśīya*. The hero had met the heroine and afterwards he was talking to his close companion, the *Vidūṣaka* about her beauty; he says: "She is an ornament to ornaments; she is a peculiar decoration to the process of decorating; her form is what is to be compared with, in relation to all with which beautiful things are generally compared."[20] An ornament generally adds to the beauty of a thing; but in the case of the heroine, the ornament receives some beauty when it is worn by her. The proces of decorating itself receives some decoration when it is done on her body. Generally things are compared in point of beauty with things that are more beautiful; but in her case whatever things one may think of for comparing her with, the result is that such a thing will have to be compared with her form which is always more beautiful. In this description, a beautiful thing is spoken of as adding beauty to even another beautiful thing; but in the *Kumārasambhava* and in the *Śākuntala*, the beautiful thing is spoken of as giving beauty to what are not generally beautiful, what are even ugly and what usually spoil the beauty of things. But transference of beauty to another is in both of these descriptions of what is beautiful.

Here there is also hinted KALIDASA's theory of poetic beauty. If a poem is really beautiful, it makes things in this world dealt with in the poem more beautiful, and even what are not beautiful in the world acquire beauty through being dealt with in the beautiful poem. There are many things in the world that are accepted as beautiful. The business of a poet is not to describe such things in his poem as beautiful. He must present them in the poem as more beautiful than what they were in the world. Then, there are things in the world which are condemned as ugly; the business of a poet is not to discard them as unworthy in a poem The poet must so introduce them in his poetry that they also appear as beautiful in the poetry. The poet is not a mirror of the world. The poe is something more. It is the Veda, the ordinary texts dealing with right conduct, that should reflect the law of the world. The poet has his own law and his own world and his own codes of conduct. What is wrong in the world may appear as right in the poet's world, and what is ugly in the world becomes beautiful in the poet's world. The various emotions remain distinct from one another in the world, and it is only some of them like love, wonder etc. that can be associated with pleasurable feelings in the actual world. But in the poet's world, whether it is love or terror, whether it is wonder or aversion, all ultimately resolve themselves into a feeling of pleasure. That is how even what are ugly in the world can become beautiful when dealt with by a poet.

There are beautiful and ugly things in the world. Beautiful things make other beautiful things more beautiful. Beautiful things make even ugly things beautiful. This is how the poet sees things in this world. There is another stage. Can there be real beauty in the world created by the creator? Is not beauty confined to the creation of a poet? At best, beautiful things can be created by certain agencies that are associated in the world with beauty. But the creator who has created both beautiful and ugly things, who has created both happiness and suffering in the world cannot be accepted as the creator of true beauty and true happiness, which must be free from ugliness and from suffering. This is the next stage in the development of the theory of beauty in poetry as conceived by KALIDASA. Even if we accept the creator as the creator of real beauty also besides the world, such a creation of the true beauty must be prior to the creation of this world of beauty and ugliness, the world of happiness and suffering.

In the *Vikramorvaśīya*, KALIDASA says of the heroine: "In the matter of the creation of this lady, did the moon take the position of the creator, who is full of fascinating lustre? Or is it the lord of Love (Kama) who has only one emotion, and that is love? Or is it the Spring season that produces the various flowers? How can that aged sage be competent to create this enchanting form, when his mind has become dull through the study of the Vedas, when all his interests are withdrawn from the affairs of the world?" [21] The story is that the celestial nymphs went to the aged sage named Narayana and tried to shake him off from his penance through their sports and attractive forms and the sage created a new nymph to put them all to shame. That nymph is Urvasi, who is the heroine in the drama. The poet says that if she had been created by that sage Narayana, it must be an accident; the real creator must be some one else,

Here there is a hint that the ordinary agents for creation cannot be the creators of real beauty and that if there is a real beauty, it must have been created by some another agent. It may be the creation of the moon or of the Lord of Love or of the Spring season. The view is that if we ascribe the creatorship to some outside agent it must be only agents like the moon and the Lord of Love. Really it is only a poet's creation. In the *Meghadūta*, it is said about the heroine: "She who would be in that home is the first creation in respect of women". [22] After the creator started the creation of women whom we see ordinarily in this world, it is impossible that the same creator could create such a beauty. She must have been created prior to it. In both the above citations, the idea that there is no possibility of real beauty being found in this world created by the creator, is quite plain. There is no comparison between the beauty that is found in this world and the beauty which a poet creats.

There are certain things in this world that are accepted as beautiful, and such things can be assembled together to form a beautiful object. But the beauty created by a poet is not a mere assemblage of such beautiful parts. The poet's beauty is something quite different. That is why in the *Meghadūta*, there is a description of the various limbs of the heroine as of surpassing beauty, and then in the end it is said that the heroine is not such an ordinary beauty; she is the first in the creations of the creator, so far as women are concerned.[23] There is a mention of her lips and her teeth and her waist and her eyes etc. and it is at the end of it that there is the passage just cited above. Here what KALIDASA has in view is that what is called a beauty is not an assemblage of beautiful parts. Beauty is in the whole and it has nothing to do with the parts. We do not know how that beauty in the totality is created; it is the work of a poet.

This view is more clearly expressed in the *Kumārasambhava*, when the youth cf Parvati is described. In the *Meghadūta*, the various beautiful limbs were first enumerated and then there is the general remark that the heroine is beautiful not on account of such beautiful limbs, but in a distinct way not found in the creations of the creator. Here in the *Kumārasambhava*, the poet realises that if he started on an enumeration of the beautiful limbs of the heroine, there is a possibility of the readers thinking that the beautiful form of the heroine is an assemblage of such beautiful limbs. The beauty of a form is not in the eyes or in the lips or in teeth. It is in the total form, with no reference to the parts. The poet says about the youth of the heroine: "Then she attained to that age following the childhood, which is a decoration to the tender limbs that has not been collected from outside, which is the cause of intoxication that does not have the name of wine, which is a weapon of the Lord of Love, distinct from the flowers." [24] "Her form was measured out and apportioned by the new youth, making the form shine as a perfect square, making it look like a picture drawn out with a brush, like a lotus that has been opened by the rays of the sun." [25] It is after this general statement that there is a long description of the various limbs of the heroine in sixteen verses.[26] After the description of the various limbs there is again the statement: " She apppears to have been created by the creator with great effort to satisfy his desire to see all the objects that are selected for purposes of comparison, arranged in their proper places and yielding a beauty as abiding in a single place." [27] The things selected for comparison are the beautiful things in this world. They have their own beauty in their individual capacity, but if they are brought together in a single place and if they are arranged in their own respective places, there is a new beauty created by such a union and such an arrangement. Here also the same idea that there is a new beauty in the totality distinct from the parts, is again emphasised at the end of the enumeration of the various beautiful limbs of the heroine.

In the two introductory verses there is another great principle involved which is very important for understanding the conception of beauty according to KALIDASA. Beauty is something to be realised in one's imagination, and it cannot be fully and really grasped through the senses. The senses catch things that are material, and beauty is not what abides in the material things of this world. The usual ornaments that are brought from outside and placed in the appropriate limbs do not create that real beauty which KALIDASA is trying to impress on us. Yet the youth of Parvati was an ornament to her body. It is something that pervaded the whole of her body; it was not confined to separate limbs. It cannot be seen with the eyes; it cannot be handled. It has to be realised in one's imagination. In the same way, the youth of Parvati created some intoxication in the minds of the people who looked at her. Usually it is wine that is the cause of a pleasurable intoxication and in the present case, there is no materiality attached to this cause of intoxication. The Lord of Love inspires people with love when they see such a form; but here it is not any material flowers, which are the usual weapons of the Lord of Love, according to the convention of poets in India. The effect of the decoration is there in a far more intense way, the effect of intoxicating wine is there and the effect of the work of the Lord of Love is also there. But the gross materials are not there. If there is materiality, there cannot be that ideal effect. It is like the best poem being what one cannot compose in language form that can be recited; it is like the best music which one cannot sing with his audible voice; it is like the best painting which one cannot draw with visible colours. They in their best form are only in the imagination of the artist.

Then in the next verse, KALIDASA says that the touch of the hand produces some stain on the art. Therefore he compares the youth that had pervaded the body of Parvati as a picture that has been painted with a brush, without the hand touching the object. If the whole form had been produced as a concrete, material thing with the hand, then the hand will produce some flaw in it. That is why KALIDASA says that the form of Parvati was not moulded with the hands; it was only drawn out with a brush like a picture. And a picture painted with a brush is less material than a form moulded with the hand. If one takes a lotus bud and opens the petals with his fingers, the flower so opened does not have the perfect beauty of the lotus flower; the lotus will be really beautiful only when it opens by itself through the contact of the rays of the sun. The form of Parvati developed into a perfect square by itself in the natural way, with no sort of operation by any hand, just through the advent and spread of the new youth in her.

Some such idea about beauty is found in the *Śākuntala* also. In the *Śākuntala*, the hero speaks about the beauty of the heroine in this way: "Her form is a flower that has not been smelt by any one; it is a tender leaf that has not been plucked out from the plant by the fingers of any one; it is a gem that has not yet been cut and bored by any cutter; it is a wine whose taste has not been enjoyed by any one. It is the undivided fruit of the good deeds done in previous births by some one. I do not know whom Providence will bring forward to enjoy this."[28] A beautiful object loses its beauty if it is touched or handled in any form; one must just enjoy its beauty without handling it. If one touches it, if one handles it, its material aspect comes in, and the handling produces a stain on the material object. To avoid the impression of this stain, it must be contemplated upon as an immaterial object.

KALIDASA gives his final touch to his doctrine of beauty in the *Śākuntala* in the same context, when the hero continues the description of the beauty of the heroine thus: " Was she created by the creator by placing her in a picture? Was it by bringing about her life with the beautiful forms of the highest nature? Or was it through his own mind? When I think of her form and the capacity of the creator, my opinion is that she is a special creation as a gem among women." [29]

A painting can be executed without the touch of the hand, with the help of a brush. Her form is so stainless that it appears to have been fashioned like a painting, where the hand has no chance to touch her. This is the first alternative. Then KALIDASA says that so much beauty cannot be brought into that form even if it were a painting. She must have been endowed with life through a mixture of all the highest things in the world from the point of view of beauty. But even in this process the hand must have had a part, which always detracts from the perfect beauty of a form. Then KALIDASA suggests that she might have been created with the mind by the creator. The idea of a painting and the idea of the best things in the world had already appeared in the works of KALIDASA as dealt with previously.[39] But the mental process is here introduced for the first time. The mind can create a beautiful object without the touch of the hand, and without casting any stain in the material form. Even with this alternative, KALIDASA is not satisfied in describing the beauty of the heroine.

This portion of the verse has been interpreted in different ways by commentators. There are four factors, namely, the painting process, the process of infusing life and existence. the utilisation of the most beautiful objects and the mental process. They are taken separately or taken as constituents of a combined single process. But we need not enter into such a critical investigation of the position. KALIDASA is not himself satisfied with any of them or all of them together. Then he says that Sakuntala must be a special creation as a gem among women. It is not even suggested here that it is the creator that has created her. We all know what the creator is capable of, what his powers of creation are, having seen the specimens of his creations in this world around us; and we also know what *her* form is. It is impossible that the same creator who created the things in this world, could have created such a beautiful form also.

Some commentators have read into this part of the verse only a doubt about the process of creation and not about the creator. Their interpretation is that there are many specimens of beauty in this world, and no such beautiful thing is a guide for us in determining the process; but the creator has infinite powers and as such he must have created the heroine in some special way, which we cannot understand. But I am definite about the real meaning, which is that the heroine is not a creation of the creator at all; she came into the world in another way, different from all the ways in which the other women have come into existence. The idea behind is: "I am a poet, and I can create a beauty through my imagination, which beauty you cannot see in this world; if you have imagination, you may try to realise the nature of that beauty. In the world created by the creator one cannot find such a beauty."

It is this view about the ideal beauty that is found in the *Raghuvaṁśa* also, where there is a reference to Indumati who appeared in the wedding hall for the choice of her husband from among the kings who had assembled there. KALIDASA speaks of her as "a creation transcending the creations of the 'creator." [31] . Here also commentators interpret the passage as meaning "what transcends the ordinary creations of the creator." But the view that a poet's creation is superior to the creations of the creator must be at the back of the mind of KALIDASA; that is the tradition in India regarding the natnre of poetry, [32] and it is impossible that KALIDASA considered his ideal of beauty only as coming *within* the creations of the creator in this world, and not as a thing that transcends the creations in the world.

KALIDASA mentions the author of the *Nāṭyaśāstra*, the great sage BHARATA in the *Vikramorvaśīya*[33] and it is impossible that he did not know the theories of BHARATA; and BHARATA considers the world of the poet as something different from and superior to the world of the creator.[34] Naturally the poetry of KALIDASA must be interpreted in the light of the theory of BHARATA. Further, there is a much later work on literary criticism, by ANANDAVARDHANA who has written the work called the *Dhvanyāloka*, and his work has been commented upon by ABHINAVAGUPTA. ABHINAVAGUPTA also comments on the work on dramaturgy by BHARATA. ANANDAVARDHANA definitely says that the meanings conveyed by the language of a poet are quite different from the meanings which the same words convey in the ordinary language.[35] The experience of poetic beauty is something that transcends the normal experience in this world, according to both ANANDAVARDHANA and ABHINAVAGUPTA. ANANDAVARDHNA accepts KALIDASA as one among the very few real poets. When we interpret KALIDASA, we cannot ignore all such views expounded by others.

There have been two lines of approach in interpreting poetry. There have been the writers on literary criticism who took a very formal view of literary values, who applied some ready-made standards for the evaluation of literature. There have been others who really understood literary values but who did not write out their rules for such appreciation and assignment of literary values. ANANDAVARDHANA was the first to write a text-book dealing with the appreciation of literary values.[36] Here he says that though the poet uses the language current in the world, the language as handled by a poet has meanings quite different from the meanings found in the world for the same language. ANANDAVARDHANA must have understood KALIDASA's theories of beauty as relating to beauty transcending the world and not as being a part of the beautiful objects in this world. There is a transcendental beauty which only persons with transcendental poetic gift can realise and present in poetic form. This must be the view of KALIDASA. It is KALIDASA who has considerably influenced ANANDAVARDHANA and his commentator ABHINAVAGUPTA in their doctrines about beauty.

KALIDASA does not say in any explicit terms that the experience of beauty transcends the experience of divine bliss while he holds the experience of beauty in poetry as superior to the experience of any other beauty. But ANANDAVARDHANA, especially his commentator ABHINAVAGUPTA, definitely identifies the experience of poetic beauty with the experience of the Supreme in the case of a mystic, and this latter experience is accepted as of the nature of perfect bliss. KALIDASA speaks of dancing as superior to the forms of the worship of the gods prescribed in the Vedas, as producing happiness, in his *Mālavikāgnimitra* when he says: "Sages regard this to be a sacrifice to the gods, charming and capable of being seen; the great God Rudra has divided this into two in his own body, which he shares with his consort, Uma; in this is to be seen the history of man arising from the three categories and endowed with many sentiments; dancing, though of various forms, is a single form of worship in the case of people of various tastes."[37] Here KALIDASA is comparing dancing with the forms of Vedic worship, usually called sacrifices, and holds dancing as superior.

ANANDAVARDHANA and ABHINAVAGUPTA hold that in its ultimate form, the experience of pleasure derived from reading a perfect piece of literary art is identical with the experience of bliss in the stage of the realisation of the Supreme. Although KALIDASA does not have anything to say on this point, KALIDASA is clear about the ethical side of the enjoyment of literary art[38]. There is a benediction found at the end of Sanskrit dramas and in the case of all the three dramas, KALIDASA brings in the same idea, regarding the ethical value of literary art, how it produces public happiness. At the end of the drama *Mālavikāgnimitra* there is the statement: "O *Caṇḍī* look thou upon me, with a propitiated look ; this is all that I ask of you on behalf of the rival."[39] The king had a queen and the drama deals with the love of the king for another lady, the heroine, whom ultimately he marries; the first queen was trying to bring abstacles in the way of this second marriage. As generally interpreted, the above statement is put into the mouth of the hero, addressed to the first queen. The rival is the heroine, the second wife. But this interpretation is absolutely opposed to the situation when the statement is made. The queen objected to the second marriage for political reasons;[40] the king had agreed to marry the sister of a neighbouring prince, who would then be his ally and helper in his wars with his enemies. If the king at that stage contracted another marriage, that would stand in the way of the political alliance; this was the sole ground for the queen's personal objection to that marriage. Even that objection she withdrew and she had arranged to allow the king to marry the heroine; it was at that stage that the heroine was identified as the very princess with whom a marriage had been thought of for the king. The queen was very happy about the turn of events.[41] The correct interpretation must be another.

The above passage is not a part of the dialogue among the characters of the drama; it is the usual benediction at the end of a drama. *Caṇḍī* does not mean "a wrathful women" but only the goddess of that name, and the rivals are the people who were supposed to be opposed to the drama of a living author. In the beginning of the drama it was suggested that people might not take delight in seeing the performance of a drama by a living author. [42] The statement cited above is the first part of the benediction; and the second part states that there is no need for prayers to bless the people with freedom from national calamities, since Agnimitra was ruling the country. Therefore such a prayer is given up and there is only a prayer that the rivals of the poet who would not take delight in his drama may enjoy the favour of the goddess so that they could learn to enjoy a piece of literary art of even a contemporary author. The rivals are mostly from the rich class, who do not know the real values of literatures. The leader of the dramatic troupe is more interested in getting such rich men among the audience, and that is why, when the name of the drama and of the drametist was announced in the prologue there was a fear that such rich people may not care for it. At the end of the drama there is a prayer that rich people may be blessed with some culture,'some capacity to enjoy a piece of literary art, and thereby to have some real enjoyment in life. KALIDASA must have known that people who have wealth do not usually have culture and that people with culture do not have wealth. A balanced life is when there is wealth for meeting the physical needs in this world and culture to bring in an element of *real* happiness in life. The Ruler can bring about freedom from national calamities and he can even bestow wealth on the people so that they can have material enjoyment. But there is need for some divine favour if rich people have to be blessed with culture also, and it is this divine favour that is sought for in the concluding benedictory verse of the drama *Mālavikāgnimitra*.

The same idea is contained in the benedictory verse at the end of the drama *Vikramorvaśīya*, expressed in a much clearer way. There it is said: "Wealth and culture are mutually exclusive; may their union in the same abode, which is a very rare one, be for the happiness of the good people for ever."[45] A balanced happiness requires the utilisation of wealth and the presence of culture; but they rarely come together in the same abode and they are normally antagonistic to each other. It is only by their union that there can be real happiness in the country. The same view is put in another way in the *Raghuvaṁśa*, where the king of the Anga country is described as: "In him wealth and culture have taken a common abode, though they are by nature found in different abodes."[44] The same meaning can be read into the benedictory verse at the end of the *Śākuntala* also. The verse is: "May the king work for the good of the people; may culture which is superior to even scripture, dominate the national life."[45] Culture is essentially in the form of the realisation of beauty in poetic art. Without beauty of art, life becomes one-sided, without balance.

To KALIDASA there is no real beauty in this world outside. People call certain things which they see as beautiful, because they have a pleasurable sensation at such a sight. True beauty is something that is a reality in this world, that forms the only reality in the world; but this beauty,this reality,is what transcends the world, something that only a few gifted people can see, True beauty is what can be only enjoyed and not what can be described. And can one enjoy a thing through its description? If we describe sugar, it does not amount to the enjoyment of a sweet taste. Only such a one who can see that real beauty and who can, with all the limitations attached to language, give a description of that beauty, is really a poet. This is a survival of the Vedic idea of true poetry. The Vedic poets called that real beauty, *Devaṣ* (gods). It is only such people who can see the gods in their true nature and who can present such gods in language forms, that can be accepted as a poet; and a *Ṛsi* is only a true poet in the terminology of the Vedas. The poet's description of the true beatuy in Nature is not a record of that truth in language form; it is only an indication of what true beauty in Nature is. With that indication, people with poetic talents can look at beauty and enjoy it. People without such a poetic talent cannot have any notion of that true beauty in Nature even with that indication in poetic form.

The extent to which that true beauty in Nature is seen and realised and enjoyed by any one depends on the extent to which poetic talent also exists in him. Kings can give protection to the people; they can increase the economic wealth of the country. But the capacity to see and realise and enjoy beauty is a special gift, and man depends on Providence for such gift. Where there is economic prosperity, there usually, there is no ability to enjoy beauty; they seldom exist in the same place. Those who have wealth do not care for the real beauty in this world, and those who can see beyond the things in this world and enjoy some hidden truth behind the things of the world, sometimes neglect the material wealth of the world. They are what are called the mystics. KALIDASA is not an admirer of such mystics who do not care for the material prosperity of the world. The needs of the body must be satisfied; otherwise the effort to suppress the feelings of discomfort affect the chances of enjoying that true beauty. That is why KALIDASA always prays for the union of material wealth and of poetic talent in the same place.

If any one has transcended the stage where the needs of the body have completely receded and do not call for any sort of effort for such supression, in his case, KALIDASA does not insist on the union of wealth with poetic talent. But when there is an occasion where such material wealth is needed, even such people must have the ability to bring wealth into association with their poetic talent. That is what we find in the case of the sage Kanva in the *Sākuntala,* where the forest nymphs procured all the robes and ornaments needed for the journey of Sakuntala to the home of her husband, on account of the great powers of the sage. Kanva is the greatest lover of the beauty in Nature, and this is quite evident in the way in which he arranges for the farewell of Sakuntala from the forest. It is not a farewell from the residents of the hermitage; it is a farewell from the trees and plants and flowers, and from the animals and the birds in the hermitage.

Although there is no comparison between the real beauty in the Nature and the beauty that people find in the things of the world, still what is called beauty in the assemblage of things that are considered beautiful in the world, is a reflection of that real beauty in the objects of the world.

And in this latter, what is called material wealth finds a place, and sometimes that becomes an opening and even a help in finding out and enjoying true beauty in Nature. But when that means in the form of material wealth is secured, it is wrong to stop there. One must try to find beauty in the world. True light is only what helps one to see that beauty. Real happiness is only after seeing such beauty in natue. Real heaven is a continuum of such pleasurable moments through the enjoyment of beauty in Nature. In this happiness there do not come in the limitations that prejudice the real enjoyment. This doctrine of beauty found in KALIDASA is what has come down to us from the Vedas, and is also the foundation for the theories of literary criticism elaborated by various authors in India after him. This will have to be dealt with in a different course of lectures.

ART

We know only six works of KALIDASA, three dramas, two epics and a lyric. These six works are accepted as from the pen of the same author and that author is also accepted as KALIDASA. There is a seventh work called the *Ṛtusaṁhāra*, which is in six sections, each section being the description of a season. There are six seasons according to Indian tradition. It is for this reason that this work is called the *Ṛtusaṁhāra* or a compendium on the seasons. In the case of this work, opinion is divided regarding its authenticity as the work of the same KALIDASA. But in nearly all modern works relating to KALIDASA, this seventh also is included among the works of this poet. Personally I do not include it among the genuine works of KALIDASA; the poem is far inferior in quality. This is not the place to discuss the point, in so for as the point can be discussed only in a work meant for specialists. This course of lectures is meant for the general cultured people with academic training, who are not specialists in the subject. I take the responsibility for the omission of the work from this treatment.

Many poets of a later period are known to have taken up the name of KALIDASA, sometimes the name having been given them by their patrons in appreciation and in recognition of their poetic talent. A large number of works are known as having been written by one or the other of such later KALIDASA-s. I do not propose even to mention such works, which are all outside the scope of the treatment of the works of the real, original KALIDASA. The reason for such a sifting is also beyond the scope of this course of lectures. For this reason, I have confined my remarks to the six works.

Among these six works, the epic *Kumārasambhava*, dealing with the birth of a son to Siva and Parvati after their marriage, is available only in eight cantos; here the wedding of Siva and Parvati and their honeymoon end, and there is no mention of the birth of a son. We do not know what title KALIDASA himself proposed to give to the work. In the case of the three dramas, the name of the work is given in the prologue, as is the custom among the Sanskrit dramatists. In the *Raghuvaṁśa*, the author himself says that he was writing the epic on the Dynasty of the Raghus.[1] In the lyric, we know the theme as the message sent by a Yaksha to his beloved, and the title now accepted, *Meghadūta* (Cloud-messenger) is quite appropriate. We have no such evidence to fix the title of the epic *Kumārasambhava*; we depend on tradition. If the title meant by KALIDASA is the same, and if the title means "birth of Kumara" we expect something more than the first eight cantos, which we have now with us. All are agreed that the remaining nine cantos found in print are added by a later poet; MALLINATHA has not commented on this portion, and perhaps the cantos were added by one SITARAMA whose commentary it is that is available for the portion.

It is only by an examination of the art of KALIDASA that we can come to any conclusion whether KALIDASA meant to continue the epic beyond the eight cantos now available. The last verse in the eighth canto is:

> Alike by day and by night, Siva,attached to Parvati,spent a hundred years like a single night; yet his desire for conjugal enjoyment did not come to an end.

Will a poet end an epic in this way? Certianly not; this is not a natural end for a poem. A poet satisfies the emotional needs of the reader when he closes the epic. The reader must be expecting something more following, when he goes through the epic,and if his curiosity is not satisfied when the epic is closed, that is a defect in the epic. Again, the poet might have indicated certain things in the earlier parts of the epic, and if there is no natural culmination of such points that are promised by indication, that too is a defect.

In the second canto of the *Kumārasambhava*, the gods approach Brahma[3] for pretection against the demon named Taraka who was oppressing them, and then Brahma says that it is only a son born of Siva through Parvati that can perform the feat.[4] The gods say: "Therefore we want you to create for us a leader for our army for killing him. Placing him in the front of the army, as the protector of the army, Indra must be able to bring back their splendour of victory from the enemies, who have now taken her a prisoner.[5]" It is in reply to this that Brahma said: "The son of Siva will take up the leadership of your army and release the prisoners taken by them, from among the gods.[6]" The reader expects such events to be described later, and the unity of the epic requires a continuation of the epic beyond the eight cantos.

In the *Raghuvaṁśā* there are various indications about the theme of the *Kumārasambhava*. What one feels is that the mind of KALIDASA was full of this theme when he was writing the *Raghuvaṁśa*. When a poet is intensely taken hold of by a theme, he cannot get his mind rid of that theme, and even when he writes on another theme, his mind would still be working on his favourite theme. When he was writing the *Raghuvaṁśa,* his thoughts were full of admiration for his favourite hero, Kumara, the son of Siva and Parvati, who defeated the enemies of the nation, the demons, and who saved the gods and thereby the country. The parents of this great hero, Siva and Parvatí, both so closely united to each other as to be thought of as a single person with two aspects, the father being the right side and the mother being the left side of the same person, what is known as *Ardhanārīśvara* (The God with his half as a woman,) wa also an object of admiration for KALIDASA. This too we find in the beginning of the *Raghuvaṁśa* where the prayer is to the parents of the world, Parvati and Parameswara. In this verse KALIDASA shows his great devotion to the parents of the world, the mother and the father of great hero who destroyed the enemies of the nation; this is the beginning of a hint about his intention to apply his poetic talents to the composition of a poem about that great hero. Within the *Raghuvaṁśa* itself, there is little reference to the events that are actually described in the *Kumārasambhava* with eight cantos; there is a reference to the destruction of the Lord of Love and the grief of his wife, Rati (enjoyment). This is in the description of the third of the kings of the dynasty described in the *Raghuvaṁśa* namely, Aja, whose wedding forms an important episode in the poem. Aja, when he came into the hall where the heroine was to chose her companion from among the kings assembled there, "appeared to be the Lord of Love himself, to whom his body was restored by the Lord when He was appeased by his wife, Rati.[7]" After the heroine chose Aja and when both were entering the city for the formal ceremonial of the wedding, the women were talking about him and they said, "Certainly these two must have been Rati and the Lord of Love[8]".

Except this reference to the destruction of the Lord of Love found in the *Kumārasambhava,* there is no other reference to the *Kumārasambhava* in the *Raghuvaṁśa* that has a relation to the portion now available in the epic. All the other references are to Parvati as the mother of Kumara and to Kumara as the destroyer of the enemies of the nation; and these two points do not form part of the extent portion of the *Kumārasambhava.* My own view is that, since KALIDASA makes references to the events that could form part of the epic if it had been continued, KALIDASA's mind must have been working in that direction and that for some reason or other he did not continue the epic.

The fact that I want to emphasise here is that when we think of the works of KALIDASA, we must think of a unity; all the works have some mutual relation. They all, in a total form, represent the unitary thought of KALIDASA, and they are not isolated specimens of poetic art from a common author. When we find in the *Raghuvaṁśa* that there is a prayer to the parents of the world united to each other as a single person and when there is a similar reference to the God as half man and half woman in the introductory prayer of the *Mālavikāgnimitra*, we may conclude that at that stage, his mind was full of the thoughts of the earlier part of the *Kumārasambhava* which he was planning to write. When in the later cantos of the *Raghuvaṁśa*, we find the reference more to the mother of the great hero who destroyed the enemies of the nation, we may conclude that soon after starting the *Raghuvaṁśa*, his mind became so pre-occuppied with the thoughts of the hero that he wrote out the portion till the wedding of Siva with Parvati. He concluded that portion and started on completing the *Raghuvaṁśa* that he had already started, yet his mind remaining filled with the thoughts of the great exploits of his hero. After completing the *Raghuvaṁśa* he did not, or could not, take up the completion of the *Kumārasambhava*. In the *Meghadūta* also, we find a reference to Kumara.[8] There is the description of a temple dedicated to Skanda, after the description of the famous city of Ujjayini. After Ujjayini, KALIDASA does not appear to have had much interest in the places beyond of that, and yet he makes a solitary mention of this temple, before the route comes to the Himalayan region, which rouses his interest again. In the description of his hero, Kumara, there is mention of his taking up the position of the leadership of the army of the gods and of his acceptance of a pea-cock as his vehicle. All these points show how much his mind was being agitated by the thoughts of this great warrior-god, and how he must have thought of writing the continuation of the epic about him, describing his martial exploits against the enemies of the gods. Perhaps the best poem which he was planning to write remained unwritten, namely, the latter part of his *Kumārasambhava*.

From the above references what we must infer is that KALIDASA meant to continue the epic of *Kumārasambhava* beyond the available eight Cantos. If we do not accept this position, the difficulty is that there is a very unnatural conclusion for the epic at the end of the eighth Canto and that many things promised or at least indicated in the earlier portion and also indicated in the other works of KALIDASA remain unfulfilled in the work. We cannot decide the authenticity of any work of KALIDASA by the test of "good poetry", which most often is only good versification and attractive fancies. KALIDASA is a poet and not merely a versifier; perhaps as a versifier, he was not a particular success, and there are many poets who surpass him in the art of versification. Of this I will say something later. When we take up a work of KALIDASA we must see if there is that unity and continuity in the picture and in the narration. We must not take up a portion of the work and say that since it is good versification, it is also the work of KALIDASA.

With this apparatus for testing the authenticity of the works of KALIDASA, I propose to examine the other epic of KALIDASA, the *Raghuvaṁśa*. In this epic, there are two great heroes, and there are also other kings who can claim some prominence. The two most important heroes are Raghu and Shri Rama. Prelude to the birth of Raghu forms the theme of the first two Cantos and the birth of Raghu and his exploits even as a boy form the theme in the third Canto. Raghu's accession to the throne, his conquest of the whole earth (which is only the India of KALIDASA) and his return home in triumph are described in the fourth canto; his liberality and his patronage of education, the journey of his son to the country of Vidarbha for the wedding of the sister of the king of the Vidarbhas, named Indumati, some exploits on the way, and the honoured welcome he received at the court, are found in the fifth canto. The sixth canto is devoted for the choice of a husband by Indumati from among the assembled kings, the choice falling on Raghu's son; there is the description of the wedding ceremony and his return to the kingdom with the incident of how he was waylaid by the disappointed kings and how he defeated them all single-handed, in the seventh Canto. Raghu's retirement, placing his son on the throne and his final departure, the death of the queen of the son who was placed on the throne and his own death, installing his son on the throne, form the subject-matter of the eighth Canto. From this sketch it will be found that the first eight Cantos deal with Raghu as the chief charactor in the narration. The birth of Raghu and the possibility of his becoming a great king, so great that he would be the founder of a new dynasty called after him, are introduced even in the very beginning of the epic and is often indicated in the first two Cantos, prior to the birth of Raghu[10]. Thus, there is the unity of the theme in the first eight cantos through the personality of Raghu, who deminates the Cantos. The narration never ends at the end of any of the first seven Cantos. But there is a complete stop in the narration at the end of the eighth Canto.

Shri Rama is the hero of the succeeding seven Cantos. From the point of view of the length of the narration, Raghu has only one more Canto allotted to him than Shri Rama. Same scholars hold that Shri Rama is the real hero of the whole epic and that the first eight Cantos form a sort of prelude to the main narration of the epic in the form of the story of Shri Rama, the final portion being some kind of epilogue also. Whether Shri Rama was meant by KALIDASA as the real hero of the epic or not is a matter that needs careful examination. There can be no doubt on the point that he is one of the two great heroes in the epic. Here some points relating to the art of KALIDASA have to be taken up for close consideration.

If Shri Rama is the real hero of the epic and if it is the personality of Shri Rama that creates a unity in the epic, the question arises why KALIDASA did not promise the story of Shri Rama as the theme of the epic, why he expressly stated in the beginning that the dynasty of the Raghus forms the theme for his epic. Just as Raghu and his greatness are prominently brought out in the beginning of the epic, even before the birth of Raghu, how is it that there is no mention, not even a hint of Shri Rama till we close the first part of the epic in the form of the first eight Cantos? Even if we accept the verse where there is a mention of the enemy of Ravana,[11] as genuine, it is only a casual hint and not a real indication of the advent of the great hero. There is a lack of continuity and unity; the story of Shri Rama is not a natural continuation of any preliminary narrations in the earlier part. Consequently there is no unity between the beginning and the main part of the epic. Thus, we are constrained to declare that Raghu is not described merely as an ancestor of the real hero in the person of Shri Rama; he is a real and independent hero in the epic. And Shri Rama, consequently, becomes another hero in the epic; this breaks the unity in the art. Even if we say that the theme is the dynasty of Raghu and that what KALIDASA has done is to describe the founder of the dynasty and also the greatest hero of the dynasty, and that in this way the unity is in the dynasty and not in the person of any one hero in the dynasty, there is still the difficulty in so far as certain great qualities of the kings of the dynasty of Raghu are mentioned in the beginning, while in the case of Shri Rama many of such original statements are contradicted as in the case of the introduction of the sin committed by Shri Rama's father as a prelude to his birth,[12] which is against the statement in the beginning that they are all pure and without a stain even from their birth.[13] Further, the description of the last king in the epic as a prolific, unscrupulous person, adicted to debauchery and illegitimate enjoyments, is absolutely in conflict with the starting promises. The decadence of the dynasty is not within the terms of the promise as the theme of the epic.[14] I find something unsatisfactory in the second part of the epic, after the first eight Cantos, from the point of view of the element of unity and continuity in the art.

Even in the matter of descriptions, the latter portion of the *Raghuvaṁśa* does not come up to the standards of KALIDASA's art as is found in the first eight Cantos or in the other epic of KALIDASA. In contrast to the orderly way in which the qualities of a great person are presented in the case of Dilipa in the first Canto, there is nothing but a jumble of superlatives in the description of Dasaratha, the father of Shri Rama in the nineth Canto. In the case of Dilipa, what we find is a great man, while in the case of Dasaratha, what we find is a powerful king, comparable to the various gods representing power, like Indra, Varuna and Yama, who are sometimes objects of terror also. And when we come to the narration after this description, there is a contradiction between the powers and good qualities mentioned in the description and the events narratted.[15]

The description of the Spring season in the nineth Canto of the *Raghuvaṁśa*, which has no connection with the topic at hand,[16] is far inferior; to the description of the same season in the *Kumārasambhava* where in the third Canto, there is the advent of the Spring season as a help to the Lord of Love in his attempt to move the heart of Siva and compel him to fall in love with Parvati (the daughter of the mountain of Himalayas). In the *Raghnvaṁśa* description, there is nothing but a muddle of flowers and bees and birds and other things, in contrast to the order in which various aspects of the season are presented in the *Kumārasambhava*.

Many people have asked me whether anyone except a poet of the eminence of KALIDASA can write the description of the ocean found in the thirteenth Canto of the *Raghuvaṁśa*. The situation is this; after the victory of Shri Rama over Ravana, the king of Lanka who had abducted Sita, the consort of Shri Rama, while they were in the forest, they all returned to their Capital in an aerial carriage (*Vimāna*), and when they were up in the air and over the ocean, Shri Rama started a description o; the regions below, which they could see from their position in the airf and the first object described is the ocean which they were crossing on their way from Lanka to India. The description starts thus:

> Oh daughter of the king of Videha, see the ocean full of foam, divided into two by the bridge which I had built-; it looks like the sky, clear in autumn where the stars are made visible, divided into two by the Milky Way[18].

Usually KALIDASA's descriptions have a close relation to the environments in the context; here the reference to the starry night is not in keeping with this technique of KALIDASA, as the flight does not seem to be at the night time. I am not pressing the point too much. I have grave doubts about the ocean with foam looking like the starry sky in a clear autumn night. I have seen the foamy ocean on the shore and also in the middle when seen from a ship or from an aeroplane, and I have crossed the sea by both the transports. The propriety of the simile must be looked into. Is it in accord with Nature? Let us pass on. The next is :

> They say that this (ocean) has been expanded by our revered ancestor who, when the holy horse of the father who wanted to perform the sacrifice, was removed to the other world by Kapila, made a hole in the earth to get at that horse.[19]

This is only mythology and not a Nature description. This is followed by:

> It is from this that the rays of the sun had borne a faetus; treasures attain expanse in this; he bears the fire that has water as its fuel; by this was produced the lustre that gives joy (i. e., the moon).[20]

Again we find only the exhibition of mythological erudition and no appreciation of the beauty of the ocean and its grandeur.

> Its form is incapable of being ascertained either as "like this" or as "of this size", like the form of Vishnu, since it acquires such and such different conditions and since it stands pervading the ten quarters of the world.[21]

One may wonder how the ocean can expand in ten directions. Its expanse in two dimensions is quite understandable, which covers only eight directions on the compass, and its depth constitutes another direction; where is the tenth? Is it the tide?

> The great Self (Vishnu) lies in this, being praised by the first creator with his seat on a lotus produced from his (Vishnu's) navel, enjoying the Yogic sleep appropriate at the end of the *Yugas* (Aeons) with the whole world drawn into himself.[22]

This is a description of another ocean, the milky ocean and not the ocean seen by them from the air. I do not press this point too, very far. This is followed by:

> Mountains in hundreds, being oppressed by Indra who was cutting down their wings, find refuge in him who is worthy of being resorted to for safety, like kings finding refuge in a neutral king full of virtues, when they are attacked by enemies.[23]

There is only a mythological allusion here. I translate the rest of the description without comments:

For the earth, which was associated with the action of being lifted from the nether-world by the First-born Self, the clear waters from this that had swollen at the time of the deluge, became for a moment the decoration on the face.[24]

The rivers are by nature dexterous in offering their lips and he (the ocean) himself is also trained in offering his lips in the form of the waves; thus in a way not usual among others to behave towards the wife, he drinks and also makes the rivers to drink (the lip).[25]

These whales, having their mouths open, take in the water from the river mouth along with animals, and then closing their month shoot up currents of water with their heads that have holes in them.[26]

See the foams in the ocean, split up into two by the crocodiles with elephants' form that jump up suddenly; these foams, being deposited on their cheeks become *Cāmaras* on their ears for a moment.[27]

The serpants stretching on the sea-shore to enjoy the wind, not at all distinguishable from the big swollen waves, have to be recognised to be such on account of the gems that are situated on their hoods and that get their red colour increased through the contact of the rays of the sun.[28]

This collection of conch-shells, being suddenly thrown about by the force of the waves among corals that vie with your lips, get their mouths woven with the rays that start upwards and somehow or other with great effort, get away from them.[29]

On account of the cloud which had just started drinking the waters of the ocean and which turn round through the force of the whirl-pools, this ocean appears very clearly to be churned again with a mountain.[30]

The shore of the salt-ocean, which is really like the iron-rim of a wheel, but which on account of distance has become slender, and dark with the rows of forests of *Tamāla* and palm-trees, appears to be a dark line drawn with a sharp edge.[31]

At this stage, the aerial car had reached the shore of the ocean and the description of the ocean too comes to an end. Now, I give my own comments on this description, which is being praised as really grand. When we read a description of the ocean, we expect to see the waves dashing against the shore, the vast expanse of the waters, the sailors with their small boats on the shore-side or with their ocean-going ships propelled by sails on the tall masts, the birds dancing on the crests of the huge waves in rows, the far off-shore with sands or with dark trees, the horizon and the clouds of various colours along the horizon and such objects of Nature. The mythological details about the ocean are not what one *sees*, and even as a description of the ocean, they have little interest or relevency in the context. Can anyone see from high up in the air, the whales shooting up currents of water through the holes in their heads or the conch-shells being caught in corals and getting themselves extricated from them? The foam was first pictured as resembling the starry sky in a clear autumn night and is again presented as two *Cāmaras*[32] on the ear of crocodiles when they are stuck on their cheeks. Can there be serpants so big, moving about on the shore in such a way as to resemble huge waves? And can any one see from such a height the gems on their hoods shining in the rays of the sun? Are those the facts of Nature which the poet *sees* in his imagination or are they simply facts studied from books and incorporated in verses written from the study-table? This is not the production of a poet. This is the versification of a scholiast. The entire description of the route traversed by the party from Lanka to the Capital of the country is in the same strain. I have also heard praises about the description of the confluence of the Ganga and the Yamuna towards the close of the journey in a few verses.[33] I have already given one specimen of the so-called Nature description in this situation, and this latter description is not different from that. Everywhere we find more the erudition of a scholiast than the imagination of a poet.

In the first eight Cantos, KALIDASA never makes a full narration of a dry story; he selects a definite point and expands that point into a beautiful poem. Thus in the case of Dilipa, we find only his life in the forest[34]; in the case of Raghu, there is his valour in his fight against Indra,[35] his conquest of the whole country[36] and his liberality and patronage of education.[37] The wedding[38] and the sorrow at separation, at a letter stage, from his spouce form the theme for poetry in the case of the third king Aja. Then, when we are in the latter half, we find the *whole* of the *Rāmāyaṇa* story narrated, cansisting of both the original six Books and the latter Book,[40] the description of Dasaratha[41] being only an episode in this narration. We do not see the *art* of KALIDASA in the narration of the *Rāmāyaṇa* story.

After the *Rāmāyaṇa* porton, there is the description of the son of Shri Rama, [42] and his grandson Atithi.[43] Then a large number of kings are described, more on the model of the Purana enumerations[44] and there comes the final, abortive description of Agnivarna. In the case of the son and grandson of Shri Rama, all that I have to say is that there is no unity, like the unity that we find in the case of the portion relating to the first three kings, the story in it never ending at the close of a Canto. In the latter part, the story of Shri Rama ends with the fifteenth Canto, and the story of the son and grandson takes up one Canto each[46] Thus here we have only a narration and not an artistic unity. I consider the unity and the continuity as the real test for determining the authenticity of any poem as the work of KALIDASA.

This artistic unity is the most prominent feature in the poetry of KALIDASA. Another important feature in the art of KALIDAS is the propriety, in the form of the harmony between the description and the situation where such description is introduced. If KALIDASA describes any object of Nature in a particular context, that description is appropriate to that context and not to another.[47] Thus, if he describes the ocean in a special situation, what we find is not any ocean, but that particular ocean which is appropriate to the context. The same is the case with the description of a garden or a forest or a season. In describing the ocean, he dees not mention all that he could have known from mythology or from other sources about the ocean; in describing a garden or a forest, he does not simply give a catalouge of all the trees and the creepers and the flowers and the birds and the animals known in a lexicon. There is an individuality in every aspect of Nature which he describes, particularly related to the context. It is when I apply such a test that I begin to feel a little diffidence about the authenticity of the descriptions in the latter half of the *Raghuvaṁśa* as the work of KALIDASA. The ocean described in the thirteenth Canto of the *Raghuvaṁśa* is the ocean known from books and not the ocean seen by the poet with his poetic eye in a special context.

When KALIDASA narrates events about any character, we see a personality with some specific characteristics, with an individuality. He does not narrate a story to make it interestiug. Thus, in the *Raghuvaṁśa* there is something specific in the character of the first three kings, while we are not able to say what it is that is characteristic of either Dasaratha or of Shri Rama, what they actually represent.[48] We have descriptions with superlatives and hyperboles, and we have faithful narration of the story of Shri Rama as found in the *Rāmāyaṇa*. In the *Kumārasambhava*, we see individualised characters, sharply drawn out, like the Himavan, his daughter Parvati, Siva, Indra and Kamadeva. Each is a character, a personality with an individuality. In the *Śākuntala,* we see the personality of Kanva, of the two companions of the heroine, and of a disciple of Kanva. I cannot say that the hero and the heroine are so successfully drawn out as characters. I do not see any specifically individualitistic character in the *Vikramorvaśīya.* It is in the drama, *Mālavikāgnimitra,* that we find the real genius of KALIDASA in character delination. Here practically every character is an individual. The delination of the characters of the hero and the heroine is simply superb in this drama, unparalled in any other drama, even of KALIDASA himself. Even in the case of the greatest artist, the hero and the heroine have a tendency to be more of types than of individuals. There is little of activity about them; they move on in the current. But in the *Mālavikāgnimitra,* we find a different thing. Both the hero and the heroine are full of initiative, bold and supremely resourceful. They move the story and do not let themselves being drifted in the current of the story. The greatest success of KALIDASA in the matter of character delination is in the case of the *Vidūṣaka* (the confidential companion of the hero) in the *Mālavikāgnimitra.* This character usually represents a type, and the *Vidūṣaka* of the *Śākuntala* can as well find a place in the *Vikramorvaśīya.* They say the same thing in both the dramas, they behave in the same way and they impress on us, if they do it at all, in the same way. But the *Vidūṣaka* in the *Mālavikāgnimitra* is a character with an individuality. There are few such *Vidūṣakas* in the Sanskrit dramas, the others being in the *Mṛcchakaṭika* of SUDRAKA and the *Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa* attributed to BHASA.

Another important feature in the art of KALIDASA is the way in which he takes up ingredients that are far apart from one another and how he builds up a complete whole out of them by putting each ingredient in its proper place in relation to the others and in proper proportions. As a matter of fact, in an art the farther apart the parts are the higher becomes the beauty of the whole. I will have to deal with this point in greater detail in another lecture on harmony; but in dealing with the art of KALIDASA, I cannot omit the point. This power of KALIDASA is found exhibited in various forms, in character deliniation, in presenting situations and in intertwining plots.

In the *Raghuvaṁśa,* the great king Dilipa is presented as an ordinary man tending a cow in the forest; Raghu his son, in the height of his triumph is found to be a poor man without the means to help a needy student who approached him for help in his studies; Aja is both a lovable bride-groom and also a great hero. In the *Kumārasambhava,* the great God Siva, who took to eternal penance is converted into a lover and a bride-groom, at last marrying the daughter of the Himalayas and enjoying the honey-moon for a hundred years and yet not satisfied. In the *Śākuntala,* Kanva who took to enternal celebacy becomes a fond father. In the *Mālavikāgnimitra,* the hero is one of the greatest of warriors and at the same time, he is also a submissive suitor. In this drama there is an intertwining of two plots, one political and the other domestic. There is war and political strategy mixed up with domestic intrigues and love-making. In the *Raghuvaṁśa,* a situation of remorse consequent on the death of the queen of Aja, the third king, is slowly converted into a situation of eternal enjoyment for the hero in the company of his wife through the medium of the message of solace from the family teacher to the bereaved king. In the case of Raghu, the great king of the gods showering his weapons from above and the boy prince having to shoot his weapons upwards from below, in addition to the contrast between their status and the positions from which they have to fight and their resources in arms–all these facts are likely to create an impression that the results are fore-doomed in the conflict. This is likely to take away all interest in the poem. But KALIDASA manages to make the boy prince a match, even more than a match, to the king of heavens. I have presented only some specimens; I can multiply instances.

There are certain characters in a drama that are meant to be types, and in such characters, we do not find any sort of individuality, and we have no right to expect any. Such is for example, a *Kañcukin* (the man in uniform), the chamberlein. What he says in one drama is equally appropriate in the *Kañcukin* of another drama. In the *Śākuntala,* the *Kañcukin* says in the beginning of the fifth Act that he had been carrying a mace with him in the residental quarters of the palace, simply in so far as such is the custom; when he grew old, the same stick became useful, helping him in walking[49]. In the *Vikramorvaśīya,* there is a *Kañcukin* in the third Act, where he says that normally people work when they are in health, and that when they grow old, thev have their sons to take up the burden of work and they can get some rest; but in his case, even in his advanced age, his service brings with it much of physical fatigue especially since he has to serve the womenfolk in the palace.[50] The context and the character of the *Kañcukin* lose nothing in the dramas if the two speeches are interchanged. When the official bards sing in praise of the king, there is a set standard of theme and method, and they can fit into any context in any drama. These are types and the dramatist simply presents the types. The same is the case with the confidential companion of the hero, the *Vidūṣaka.* It is seldom that a dramatist deviates from the set standards in the deliniation of the character of this *Vidūṣaka.*KALIDASA has deviated from the standard in the case of the *Vidūṣaka* in the

Mālavikāgnimitra and a few other dramatists too have done so, as SUDRAKA in his *Mṛcchakaṭika* and the author of the *Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa* in that drama.

In the case of the hero and heroine in the *Śākuntala* and in the *Vikramorvaśīya,* KALIDASA follows same set standards. In the *Vikramorvaśīya* there is no plot, and as such nothing need be said about the hero or the heroine; no character has an individuality in this drama. The interest in the drama centres round other points and not round characterisation. In the *Śākuntala,* there are characters with life, with initiative and with resourcefulness and with activity, like Kanva and the two companions of the heroine. The purpose of the drama is to present the hero as moving in the current set by the great Sage, whom I will call the "hero not seen," in contrast to Dushyanta who is the "hero whom we see" but who does not act. The heroine also moves in the current set by her two companions. The result is that we see the hero and the heroine modelled on certain conventional and classical standards. In this drama also, the plot is subordinate to the personality of Kanva, and there is little scope for action on the part of the other characters in the story. Kanva dominates the whole drama.

In the case of the *Mālavikāgnimitra,* it is a drama of action and consequently a drama of plot interest; there can be action and there can be a plot only if the characters have life and if they all can move about by themselves instead of being carried away in a current set by others. In this drama, there is no interest in the form of music and dance and in the presence of celestial nymphs, nor is there the interest created by the presence of a dominating personality like Kanva. The great interest is in the intertwining of the two plots, one political and the other domestic, and in the movement in the story. As such every character must have life and action. The three dramas represent distinct types of dramatic art.

Writers on *Alaṅkāra* (literary criticism) in Sanskrit speak of two kinds of dramas, one with *Sṛṅgāra* (love) as the dominating emotion and the other with *Vīra* (heroism) as the dominating emotion. All the three dramas of KALIDASA are accepted as having *Sṛṅgāra* as the dominating emotion. Practically all the dramas in Sanskrit have this emotion dominating. In the case of BHAVABHUTI's *Uttararāmacarita* there is some controversy about the dominating emotion, whether it is *Sṛṅgāra* in separation (*Vipralambhasṛṅgāra*) or remorse (*Karuṇa*). VISAKHADATTA's *Mudrārākṣasa* and BHATTA NARAYANA's *Veṇīsaṁhāra* are the classical examples of dramas with heroism as the dominating emotion. This classification requires careful examination.

I can do so only in another place, where I propose to trace the course of literary criticism in Sanskrit. But I can give a hint here regarding my own views on the point. There are two kinds of dramas. In one variety, there is developed in one of the characters, usually the hero, certain emotions on account of the presence of another character usually the heroine, in a certain environment, with particular behaviour; they are styled *Ālambanavibhāva* and *Uddīpanavibhāva*, *Anubhāva* and *Sāttvika* and *Vyabhicāribhāva*. This emotion developed in the hero is transfered to the audience. In the other type, the activities of the characters directly develop a certain emotion in the audience. These two are what I will style *Rasa* dramas (dramas with an emotional appeal) and Action dramas. The dominant emotion found in the first type is *Sṛṅgāra*. That is why the two types are called *Sṛṅgāra* and *Vīra* (Action) dramas. As a matter of fact, Bhoja in his famous work on literary criticism called the *Sṛṅgāraprakāśa*, recognises only one real *Rasa*, and that is *Sṛṅgāra*. This is a very controversial point which I am introducing; I cannot substantiate my point here; that requires separate treatment. Yet I can give some reasons for postulating my theory about *Sṛṅgāra* and *Vīra* dramas in Sanskrit literature.

I take *Śākuntala* as the recognised type of a drama with *Sṛṅgāra* as the dominating emotion. But, is it *Sṛṅgāra* that really appeals to the audience from the beginning to the end? The love affair between the hero and the heroine comes to a close with the third Act;[51] there is what can be called the emotion of love in separation in the sixth Act.[52] In the fourth, fifth and seventh Acts, there is no element of love. In the re-union of the hero with the heroine at the close of the seventh Act, which is also the final Act, there is no indication of a love element playing any part. How can we say that *Sṛṅgāra* is the *Sthāyibhāva* (the emotion that persists from beginning to the end) in this drama? The statement of the writers on *Alaṅkāra* (literary criticism) that in a drama, the dominating emotion must be *Sṛṅgāra* or *Vīra*[53] is based on an attempt on a formal analysis of the literary types and framing of rules to distinguish the types from one another. It has little to do with the actual content and value of the dramas. I will deal with all such points in another place. Here I simply state that in the three dramas of KALIDASA we see three types, and in the three, the point round which the interest centres is different. We see also the difference in the technique in the art of KALIDASA in the three dramas, corresponding to the three types and the three points of interest in them. There is music and dance in one,[54] there is a slow developmont of an emotion in another[55] and there is intense action in the third,[56] According to them, the characterisation also differs in the three dramas.

There are many important points that have to be taken into account in estimating the art of KALIDASA. I have only indicated some points to show that there is scope for making a new approach to the problem of KALIDASA criticism. KALIDASA must be studied from his dramas themselves, and not with the test of the rules framed by the writers on literary criticism. Now I take up the point of language and style in the art of KALIDASA.

KALIDASA's theme is simple in all his works; there are no intricacies in the plot, nor any surprises and emotional outbursts. And KALIDASA presents his simple theme in an appropriately simple language. His language is so simple that children start the study of Sanskrit with the works of KALIDASA, especially the *Raghuvaṁśa*. Yet his art is so ripe and advanced that even people in their mature age find enough scope for close study in the works of KALIDASA, which they had started studying when they were only children.[57] I do not know whether there is another set of poetry in any language which exhibits such a feature. The language is direct and straightforward, free from grammatical intricacies and unfamiliar words. Only a study of the simple elements in grammar is required for the study of the works of KALIDASA. Long compounds are rare and even when they are met with, they too are very simple and easily analysed and understood. All the words are what can be seen in lexicons in their ordinary meanings.[58] One need not hunt for the words found in the works of KALIDASA, in all sorts of lexicons, where rare words and words in rare meanings are collected. KALIDASA uses words in their *Rūḍhi* (or generally accepted) meanings; yet he has a purpose in selecting such words in so far as in many cases the etymological meaning, the meaning of the elements constituting the words,[59] has the power of suggesting certain ideas. He does not select words because they fit into the metre; he selects words because that word brings out a particular suggested idea. In this way it would be found that in most cases both the *Rūḍhi* (conventional meanig) and the *Yaugika* (etymological meaning) have a purpose in the contexts.

KALIDASA never indulges in hyperboles, in superlatives, in exaggerations. He does not use adjectives unless the adjective adds something to the context. There is no attempt on his part to resort to play upon words, to produce the effect of sounds. There is little that can be called an ornamentation of style. What characterises KALIDASA's language is not anything that constitutes a "style". It is only the absence of jerks and jolts; there is never a ruggedness. Whether deliberate and voluntary or whether only Natural we do not know: there are occasions when we find something of an ornate style in him, as in:

tāmbūlavallīpariṇaddhapūgāsv elālatāliṅgitacandanāsu
tamālapatrāstaraṇāsu rantum prasīda śaśvan malayasthalīṣu.[60]

There are other places where KALIDASA is deliberate in introducing some ornamentation of style, and in such cases, his poetry fails. I cannot say that they are interpolations of a later date. I find such things especially in the *Raghuvaṁśa*. I cannot also say that they are in his poems of his immature days. It may be that the first Canto in the *Raghuvaṁśa* is an earlier composition of KALIDASA, as the beginning of the poem shows. It is perhaps his first attempt at writing a serious poem. But it is certain that the later Cantos (even including the second Canto) are to be assigned to an advanced stage. In the fifth Canto, there is the verse.

sa mṛṇmaye vītahiraṇmayatvāt pātre nidhāyārghyam anargh aśïaḥ
śrutaprakāśam yaśasā prakāśaḥ pratyujjagāmātithim ātitheyaḥ

Here in all the four lines there is a repitition of two syllables. The repeated syllables in all the four cases have the same meaning more or less,as the original syllables. Thus there is *maye* with *maya* in the first line meaning "made of"*arghya* with *argha* in the second,having more or less the same meaning of "value" (although in the first case the meaning is a conventional one for the word) , *prakāśa* in the third meaning "lustre" and *atithi* with *ātitheya* in the fourth meaning "guest". But it is in the first Canto that we find a profusion of such an attempt at ornamentation. Thus there is :

sa duṣprāpayaśāḥ prāpad āśramam śrāntavāhanaḥ
sāyam sāṁyaminas tasya maharṣer mahiṣìsakhaḥ

Here *duṣprāpayaśāḥ*(impossible for others to reach to his fame) has no relevency at all, and its only use is that there is the word *prāpat*, with which it forms an ornamentation of alliteration. The other alliterated syllables too have little significance in the context[62].

tasmai sabhyāḥ sabhāryāya goptre guptatamendriyaḥ
arhaṇām arhate cakrur munayo nayacakṣuṣe

In all such cases we find only an attempt at versification that may make an appeal from the point of the sound-effect. It is not good poetry. But later KALIDASA has thrown off this device and has continued his poetry as art, without such external embellishments.

Except such small lapses that are few in number and not at all persistent in his poetry, it must be said that the style of KALIDASA is simple and melodious, pleasing to the ear, but not at all tiring to the mind through the monotomy of the effect of the sound by way of alliterations and other devices. Sometimes it is real sweet music. But never do the words and their sounds drown the beauty of his art, which is in the method of the presentation of the theme. His language is only a medium for his art, and not at all the important material in his art, as is the case with many other poets in Sanskrit literature. Thus, he never indulges in devoting a whole, or at least a good portion, of a Canto for the exhibition of his skill in manipulating alliterations called *Yamaka* and other devices.[64] I have my own doubts about the authenticity of the nineth Canto of the *Raghuvaṁśa* where a good portion of the Canto is devoted for this exhibition[65].

Practically he never repeats an idea one after the other, unlike other poets who take up a point and repeat it over and over again in different forms. Nor does he lag on with a description through a whole Canto or Cantos. Thus, in the *Śiśupālavadha* of MAGHA it will be found that more than half the poem is devoted to the description of the Raivataka mountain and Shri Krishna's halt on its sides and the sports and revels during that halt. His predecessor, BHARAVI, whose *Kirātārjunīya* is the model for MAGHA, also devotes whole Cantos for such descriptions, though not to the axtent to which his follower goes. Arjuna's journey to the Himalayas, the start of his penance and the attempts of the celestial nymphs to entice him from his determination, take up a few Cantos. In KALIDASA we never meet with such descriptions that shut off the progress of the main theme from our view. When we find two verses repeating the same piont, it is also found that one is not up to the KALIDASA standards and looks like a later interpolation ; when there is a long description with little relevency to the context, as the description of the Spring season in the nineth Canto of the *Raghuvaṁśa*,[66] there is also room for doubt that it may be an interpolation. But I cannot say the same thing about the verses containing alliterations that spoil the poetry in the earlier cantos of the *Raghuvaṁśa*, in so far as such verses are needed to keep up the continuity of the narration. In such cases, KALIDASA has become a victim to certain temptations of catching the ears of the common readers rather than appealing to the imagination.

I have already said that KALIDASA is essentially a poet of Nature and of the common people. The beauty of the Nature and the way in which man's emotions work, are the two main themes on which his poetry is written. But there are places where we find a reflection of his erudition and his deep knowledge of the various systems of philosophy and of sciences like grammar. When KALIDASA speaks of the God and the Goddess as united to each other like word and mearing[67] or when he says that the demon had displaced the gods in heaven like an exception displacing general rules [68] or when he speaks of the queen of Dilipa following the king to the forest a little way from the hermitage like the *Smṛti* following the meaning of *Śruti*,[69] we find that KALIDASA is able to maintain his poetic genius even when his erudition claims a place in his poetry. Even here I cannot say that he is always successful. The general lore that was current in his time tries to intrude into his poetry as when Dilipa and his queen sitting on the same chariot are compared to lightning and Airavata sitting on a rain-cloud.[70] Here the poetic talent is completely drowned in his erudition. But such cases are also very rare. I do not discard them as interpolations.

The conventional notions current in his time play a great part in his poetry; but they do not affect the beauty of his poetry. Thus, in the *Mālavikāgnimitra*, the queen asks the heroine to go to the garden as her representative and kick the *Aśoka* tree with her foot so that it may blossom. Really the tree is spoken of as having blossomed in consequence of the touch of the feet of a noble lady and this incident has a great bearing in the development of the plot; it is on this account that the queen agrees to the marriage of the hero with the heroine.[71] Some superstitions about omens like the quivering of the right hand indicating an imminent happiness in the company of a lady are found in the *Śākuntala*[72] and in the *Vikramorvāśīya* [73]

There are many references to sins and curses which do operate. In the *Raghuvaṁśa*, it is the sin of not having shown due reverence to the celestial cow that was the obstacle to Dilipa not having a son. The elephant who attacked Aja on his way to the kingdom of Vidarbha for the wedding, was a *Gandharva* who became an elephant through the curse of a sage. Indumati whose wedding is described in detail, was a celestial nymph who became a mortal on account of the curse of a sage.

In the *Śākuntala*, the king totally forgot the events that took place in the hermitage like his meeting with the heroine, and his love affairs with her, and his ultimate marriage with her, on account of the curse of the sage Durvasas. KALIDASA lived in an atmosphere of such beliefs, and it is quite natural that he should have introduced them in his poem. In the *Śākuntala*, KALIDASA manages the story so very cleverly that the supernatural elements simply prepare the mind of the audience for the development in the plot of the story, and never really influences the movement in the plot. This is the case even with the curse of Durvasas. It requires independent treatment in a whole lecture to prove my point. The supernatural element in KALIDASA requires separate treatment, and the point has not been included in this course of lectures, and also many other points that deserve a place in any treatment of

KALIDASA's art, like grouping of characters in the drama, the systematic development of the plot to be represented by a *parabola* curve, and the private and the public aspects of the characters.

The lotus blossoms opening by the touch of the rays of the sun and the water lilies opening with the touch of the rays of the moon[74], the *Cātaka* bird, being unable to drink water, longing for drops of water falling from the clouds like a mendicant longing for alms,[75] the *Cakravāka* birds separating at night[76] and similar poetic conventions of the age find ample room in his poetry. But they never annoy us with their appearance too often or too prominently. On the whole there are not many things that spoil his art, though there are a few which cast a thin shade here and there.

KALIDASA was conscious of his poetic telents even in the beginning. In the beginning he had some temerity in starting on his professional activity of writing poetry. In the *Raghuvaṁśa*, after a prayer, there is a contrast drawn between the vastness of the subject and the narrowness of his own abilities[77] and this is followed by a fear that he may be the victim of redicule.[78] But when he says in the next verse that he was only taking up the materials prepared by his predecessors and that he was actually stringing them together into a sort of ornament,[79] his consciousness of poetic talent begins to exhibit itself. He knew that the art is not in the material, but in the form which the poet gives to the material.

The other epic of *Kumārasambhava* starts with the narration of the story without even a prayer. We know nothing of his feelings regarding the success or otherwise of his attempt, from within the poem. Perhaps by that time he was fully confident of his poetic abilities. The same is the case with the short lyric of *Meghadūta*. KALIDASA's feelings about his poetic talent become quite clear in his dramas, where there is technical scope also for such an exhibition. There, it is the custom to say something about the dramatist and the drama, in the prologue. On the basis of this point relating to his art, it is possible to ascertain the relative chronology of the three dramas also.

In the *Mālavikāgnimitra*, the *sūtradhāra*[80] announces that the drama named *Mālavikāgnimitra* by KALIDASA would be presented on that day; then his assistant asks him how, when there are eminent poets of old, people could be expected to take interest in seeing the drama of a contemporary poet. To this the *Sūtradhāra* says that nothing can become acceptable simply on the ground that it is old and nothing need be discarded on the ground that it is a contemporary product. Competent people must examine everything and decide which is good and which is bad. The same idea is found in the *Raghuvaṁśa* also, when KALIDASA says that competent people must lend their ear to his new composition, in so far as they should judge whether his poem is good or bad, just as a piece of gold is to be tested in fire to know whether it is pure or mixed up with base metal[81] Here and in the *Mālavikāgnimitra*, there is an indication of the sprouting of a confidence that when competent people would examine the new poem without prejudices, they will certainly declare the poem to be a good one. This similarity may also be taken as an indication that KALIDASA started writing the *Raghuvaṁśa* and the *Mālavikāgnimitra* more or less at the same time, and that in the early stages of his career as a poet.

When we come to the *Vikramorvaśīya*, there is a distinct mark of a greater confidence on the part of KALIDASA about the success of his drama. The *Sūtradhāra* says that the people have seen earlier dramas presented on the stage on many occasions and therefore he proposes to produce the new drama of *Vikramorvaśīya* that night. There is no comment from the assistant. He simply says, "What you command". Then there is some fear that among the audience there might be some people who may have a prejudice about the drama that it is a new one, and the *Sūtradhāra* addresses them as follows :

> Either out of regard for your friends or out of regard for a good theme, may you all listen with attention to this work of KALIDASA.[82]

The actors were old friends of the audience and they have confidence in such actors that they would select only a good drama for presentation. The theme is an old Vedic story. Ultimately, there is the recommendation that it is a work of KALIDASA. The idea behind is that their interest in the drama may start on account of the actors or of the theme, but the ultimate success of the drama will be due to the merits of the author. In this we find evidence of greater confidence in his success as a dramatist.

In the *Śākuntala* there is just a mention that the drama to be staged is a new one from the pen of KALIDASA (named the *Abhijñānaśākuntala*) and that for this there is need to pay particular attention to each and every actor that takes part in the performance. Here we find evidence of KALIDASA having established his fame. He also speaks of the distinguished audience that had assembled to see the drama enacted. This is what he says:

> This assembly consists mostly of learned people. Today we have to please this audience by a new drama ofKALIDASA

> Therefore bestow special attention on each and every actor. [83]

I do not know if there is a mention of the name of the drama in this context or whether the mere mention of KALIDASA as the author of the drama to be staged is sufficient for the people to take interest in its performance and to assemble in the theatre. Some manuscripts add the name also in this statement of the *Sūtradhāra*. It makes little difference.

Here we find the three stages through which KALIDASA's confidence in himself as an artist has developed. Even in his modesty, found in the earliest of the three dramas and in the *Raghuvaṁśa*, we can trace his consciousness of being an artist whom learned men should take into account. Later, this self-confidence becomes quite explicit without any qualifications. KALIDASA is a great artist ; he knew what his art is ; he was conscious of being an artist and he had confidence in himself as an artist.

In this particular lecture I had assembled a large number of miscellaneous points and I touched on them all in a very rambling way. I cannot within the compass of a lecture complete an adequate study of the problem. My object in dealing with the point is only to indicate the way in which we have to direct KALIDASA study. KALIDASA's art must be studied from the works of KALIDASA themselves; there may be rules prescribed for evaluating the art of any poet or dramatist. But such rules will have a use only in estimating the work of lesser artists whose art cannot be studied solely from within. Such rules have no place in KALIDASA study. After determining the art of KALIDASA, we have to fix the text of KALIDASA's works on the basis of the rules to be framed from within the works of KALIDASA. The text of KALIDASA has not yet been fixed and a correct basis for fixing the text also has not been settled. I have only suggested certain methods. By the application of such methods I have arrived at conclusions that may create serious opposition. The most important result of my study along this line is my doubt regarding the authenticity of the last eleven cantos of the *Raghuvaṁśa* as the work of KALIDASA. I have also serious doubts regarding individual verses in this epic and in other works also.

NATURE

KALIDASA is essentially a poet of Nature. In all his works, Nature is the main theme. Man comes mainly as a necessity in the technique of poetic art. In a drama there must be some action; in an epic also there must be some story. Action and story naturally centre round men. If the drama is written with animals and trees and other objects of Nature as characters, or if an epic is written with the story of such characters, that will not interest the readers. In this way, in his dramas and in his epics men are introduced to give scope for action, to give a movement in them. A lyric can be written with objects of Nature as the main centre of interest, and KALIDASA accepts an object of Nature as the main character in his *Meghadūta*, which is a short lyric. Kings come in as the chief characters in the dramas and in the epics on account of the environment in which KALIDASA lived and wrote his poetry; in his days it was the stories about kings that were best known among the people. We cannot understand the art of KALIDASA without recognising his poetry as Nature Poetry; his philosophy of life, which will be dealt with in later sections, also depends on his view of Nature as a factor in the life of the people.

Nature became a theme for poetry in the West only in very recent times. The Classics of the west do not deal with Nature. There is no trace of any appreciation of Nature in the poetry of Greece and Rome. There we find man and his emotions, but not the relation of man to Nature. The Greeks loved the ocean; but we see nothing of the beauty of the waves dashing against the shore,' in their poetry. It is at a very recent stage in the literary evolution of the west that Nature became prominent in the theme for the poets. Even there, in the beginning, Nature came in as a sort of decoration, as a sort of background in poetry and not as the real theme in it.

But India has a different tradition; to India, Nature is the real theme for poetry from the earliest known period in the history of Indian civilization. The *Ṛgveda* and parts of the *Atharvaveda*[1] represent the best specimens of Nature poetry, which has seldom been excelled or even equalled in any country, or in any age. The rivers, the dawn and the sun, the storm and the dark clouds and various other objects of Nature were endowed with life in the eyes of the poets of the Vedic age, and they saw in them and behind them and through them some beauty hidden from the view of the ordinary people, some source of a transcendental inspiration. They saw in them their own companions, even superior companions, their help and guide in their life in the world. Further, the gods about whom the Vedic poets sang, were in many cases, poets and singers.

This tradition about the beauty in Nature, the superiority of the objects of Nature, starting from the Vedas, continued in the *Mahābhārata* and in the *Rāmāyaṇa*. The authors of these two grand epics of India are great poets, and a great poet finds only poets for his characters. Whatever be the source for borrowing such characters into the poetry, the poet makes them all real poets themselves, just like the author. The love of Nature found in the *Mahābhārata* and in the *Rāmāyaṇa* is something unique in the literature of the world. I will explain.

Shri Rama had to go to the forest for fourteen years as an exile from his kingdom, forfeiting the throne to which he was the real claimant, and he was accompanied by his wife and his younger brother to the forest. What do we find in the forest ? It is not a group of three people subject to grief for their loss, thinking of regaining their lost position, burning with a spirit of revenge against those who deprived them of their claim, and longing for the day when they would be able to live in happiness in their kingdom and in the palace.

They enjoy the scenery in the forest, the changes in the various seasons and the beauty of the regions so luxurious with the splendour of the free Nature. Shri Rama and his brother one day go to the river for their bath early in the morning, and then Shri Rama talks about the beauty of the winter season[2], instead of complaining of the extreme cold and of his undeserved sufferings in the jungles. Throughout the long time they spent their life in the forest, they were only poets, admiring the beauty of Nature in the forest. Shri Rama and his wife and his brother, taken from the popular tales of the times, become poets in the hands of *Vālmīki*, and they are not kings any longer. I have given only one instance to show how the characters in a poem are themselves poets when described by a true poet, full of admiration for the beauty in Nature. The whole of the *Rāmāyaṇa* is an instance of this.

Similarly, in the *Mahābhārata* also, the characters are poets and not kings, though in the source they were kings. Yudhishthira and his wife and his four brothers had to go to the forest, being treacherously deprived of their throne and their kingdom by their enemy; they had to spend thirteen years outside their kingdom, leading a life of suffering in the forests. I will give one instance to show how in the hands of Veda Vyasa, the author of the *Mahābhārata*, they became poets and ceased to be kings who had lost their legitimate throne. As soon as the five brothers and the queen went to the forest, they decided to go to a mountain called the Gandharnadana, and all on a sudden there was a terrible cyclone. The storm and the rain and the dust compelled them to separate, since they could not see each other and since they could not hear each other. After some time, the storm subsided and they were able to get together with great difficulty. Then they decided to go to Gandhamadana mountain. And then what took place? Not one of them had a word of complaint to say about their fate and their suffering which they did not deserve. They did not utter a word of fury against their enemy. Yudhishthira on the other hand, started a long description of the beauty of the great mountain.[3] Who but a poet will sing a song in that condition ?

It is this same Vedic tradition, the love and admiration for Nature, that we find in the works of KALIDASA also. Kings taken from history or from semi-historical source cease to be kings. I have already said that they are presented as great men. Here I want to supplement that statement with the view that they are great because they are poets, lovers and admirers of Nature. Similarly, the common folk also become poets in the hands of KALIDASA, and as poets they are also great people. I did not want to say what real greatness in a man is, till I took up the point of Nature in KALIDASA. A man is great, whether he be a king or a common person, only if he is also a poet, one who admires and loves Nature. I spoke about the common elders of the cowherd settlement who greeted the king on his way to the hermitage of his family-teacher in the *Raghuvaṁśa*. The king asks them about the trees in the forest and not about their economic problems. The girls watching the rice fields were singing of the glories of the king. The young ladies in the *Meghadūta* were also lovers of Nature, interested in cultivation, collecting flowers or devoted to singing and dancing.

KALIDASA is a great poet and his characters are also poets. There can be no poetry in a barren royal court. There can be versifiers, flatterers, greedy people who glorify the kings in the hope of rewards. A poet's place is in the free world. That is why KALIDASA took the first king in his *Raghuvaṁśa*, out of the palace as soon as he was introduced, and arranged for him a procession through the forest, instead of the usual processions in the city. There were festoons on his way during the procession, and the festoons were supplied by the rows of birds, which made it unnecessary to fix poles on the way to support the festoons. There was the fragrant wind, the peacocks making a melodious sound like musicians, the antilopes with their fascinating eyes, the sweet smell from the lotus ponds and various other factors that made his forest procession far grander and far more enjoyable than anything that he could have enjoyed in the city.[4] In the hermitage there were the antilopes, and the trees watered by the maidens, the birds freely drinking water from the basement of the trees thus watered, and various other things that give joy to a poet.[5]

On the advice of the teacher, the king undertakes a vow of attending on a cow in the forest like an ordinary cowherd. But he was a greater king in this position than any king on the throne in a palace. He had removed from him all the emblems of royalty, and even all his personal attendants had been retired. He was all alone. But in that state, he was far more majestic on account of his own inate grandeur than any king. He had no crown; but he tied up his hair with some creepers and he shone greater than a king with his crown. Birds sitting on the trees made a cooing sound which was sweeter than the songs of bards and the shouts of any admiring croud in the city. There were no *Cāmara* fans for him; but the cool wind was blowing which were full of drops of water from the brook. The creepers strew flowers on the path, which were more beautiful than the parched rice and other things which the girls in the city would be scattering on his path. The antilopes looked at him in great admiration and full of confidence, and that was far more charming than the women in the cities gazing at him during his processions. There were the bamboos that were making a whistling sound from the holes in them which were filled by the forest wind, and such sound took the place of flutes to keep the tune for the music of the forest nymphs who sat in the bower of creepers and sang about his own fame, in the forest.[6]

Enjoying such a grand reception in the forest, he lived there for many days; he followed the cow like its shadow, stopping when it stopped starting again when it started, sittting down when it lay down, drinking a little water when it had a little water to drink;[7] when the king entered the forest, the wild fire subsided even without a rain, and there was an extraordinary growth of flowers and fruits in the forest; the stronger animals did not injure the weaker animals: he became a real protector in the forest.[8] In the evening when the herds of boars would be getting out of the ponds, when the birds would be flying towards their habitations on the trees, when the antilopes would be crowding on the lawns, when the forest would be getting dark, the king and the cow also returned to the hermitage of the sage.[9]

Here is a touch which is one of the most expressive that I have seen, even in KALIDASA. In this way the king was attending on the cow, following it to the forest and returning to the hermitage in the evening with the cow, for many days. One day the cow wanted to make a test of the fidelity and loyalty of the king and when they were in the forest, the cow wandered into a cave, near to the flow of the river Ganges, where there was a profusion of green grass. The king knew that the cow could not be the object of any injury even in the thoughts of others, and so he cast his eyes on the mountain to enjoy the beauty of the scenery and did not notice the cow, until there was a shriek and there was seen a lion sitting on the cow.[10] Here is a king, and he was in charge of the priceless cow belonging to the family teacher; his first and foremost responsibility was to take care of the cow and to protect it from any possible danger; yet he was a little negligent of his charge and let his eyes fall on the majestic mountain scenery. He had no business to assume that even though the cow was a divine one, no one would do any injury to the cow.[11] This is a real case of a very serious default on the part of the king. And what is the reason for this default? The king was even in that condition a poet, and to a poet wership of Nature is the highest religion; even a little neglect in other matters, however important they may be, is not a real default, if such a default was caused by the needs of the poet's religion, namely, the worship of Nature. The king was engaged in this religious worship, and that is why he neglected his duty to his charge. KALIDASA has not a word to say against this neglect on the part of the king. This touch with his brush shows what a great importance KALIDASA attached to Nature in his poetry. The lion was only an illusion created by the divine cow, and nothing adverse really took place on account of this neglect.

The second king in the *Raghuvaṁśa*, Raghu, is also a poet and not a king. He was a king in the source from which KALIDASA took the theme for his poem. But in the poem itself he also becomes a poet. After the new king had ascended the throne, there is a description of the king, and his description is coupled with the description of the Autumn season, which was the real time for a March of conquest.[12] The followers of Raghu and the heat of the sun (for both the words used is *Pratāpa*) pervaded the whole space. The rain-bow became invisible and the bow of Raghu took its place. The season had the white lotus as the imperial umbrella and there was also the water reeds with their white bunches of flowers for the imperial *Cāmara* fan.But Raghu was superior. The moon and Raghu were both full of clearness (for the moon) and propitiation (for Raghu); the word used is *Prasāda* in common. The clear white colour in the flock of swans, in the cluster of stars, in the lilies, in the waters were like the lustre of his fame. In this way, both the advent of the Autumn after the rainy season and of the new king Raghu are described together. This association of the season and the beauty of the season with the king and his prowess suggests that the king is more intimately associated with Nature than with the politics of the State. The king was prompted to undertake the march of Victory in advance by the season and his valour came only later for such a function. Here also the very intimate association of the king with Nature is emphasised by KALIDASA.

In a description of the March of Victory undertaken by a heroic king,[13] we expect the army and the war-drum and the shouts of the soldiers and the discharge of weapons. But what we actually find in the description of this March of Victory is only Nature. KALIDASA knew that he was not describing Raghu's Holiday Tour and that he was on a March of Victory; so some occasional reference to battles and victories are inevitable to make the context natural. Thus one king surrendered, another resisted and was removed from the throne, but was reinstated later in his old position, another king admitted defeat and he was allowed to remain on the throne and in another country, the army was completely routed. Yet the real interest in the whole of that canto is in the description of the objects of Nature. "His course left its clear marks on account of the kings who were compelled to lose their lustre, who were uprooted, and broken down in various ways,like the course of on elephant on account of trees of that nature."[14] "In this way, having invaded the various eastern countries, he the victorious, reached the shores of the great ocean (Bay of Bengal) dark with the palm trees."[15] The Sumha king saved his life by adopting the policy of the water-reeds (which bend before a current and do not allow themselves to be uprooted or broken.)[16] In the country of the Vangs, the king was uprooted and re-instated like rice-stalks (which are taken out from one place where they were sown, and re-placed elsewhere).[17] In the Kalinga country, the soldiers in the army of Raghu drank the water from cocoanuts like wine, using betal-leaves for a funnel.[18] The eastern coast was covered with areca-nut trees full of nuts.[19] In the southern country the elephants in Raghu's army sported in the river Kaveri.[20] The neighbourhood of the Malaya mountains was filled with the fragrance of cardamom. There were thick sandal-wood forest on the Malaya mountain, and the elephants that were tied up to the marks created by cobras on their branches, did not shake off the ropes on their necks, though they could easily break even three-fold chains.[22] In the Pandya kingdom there is the river Tamraparni[23] and pearls at the mouth of the river.[24] The fragrance from the *Ketaka* plants were wafted by the breeze from the river Murala in the Kerala country.[25] The sounds from the tall palm-trees rivalled the sounds from the bells and other strappings of the horses when they march.[26] When the elephants were tethered to the *Kharjūra*-palms, the bees that were moving round the flowers of the palm, came down to the fore-head of the elephants.[27] The country of Persia was full of grape gardens; there the soldiers of the army of Raghu spread fine antilope-skins on the ground and took complete rest after the strain of the battle with the Persians.[28] Then Raghu marched northwards from Persia and reached the country of the Huns, where the elephants in the army of Raghu removed their fatigue on the banks of the river, and shook their heads that were smeared with saffron powder,[24] (It is here that KALIDASA mentions saffron growing green on the fields, and there is a view that since saffron grows only in Kashmir, he must have belonged to that country. For one thing, the scene is far to the west of Kashmir, and KALIDASA had seen various parts of the country and knew the details about such regions.) After conquering the Kamboja country, Raghu climbed up to the Himalayas on horse-back.[30] There, there were the lions in the caves, lying down with their neck turned and looking to the back side, when the army of Raghu made a terrible noise; such calm looks announced that the lions were not at all perturbed by the army, since both the soldiers and the lions had equal courage and valour.[31] The cool winds from the Ganges carrying the drops of water from the river, creating a rustling noise in the *Bhūrja* trees, letting the bamboos make a wistling sound, greeted Raghu on his way.[32] The soldiers sat under the *Nameru* trees and took rest on the slabs of rocks that carried the fragrance from the musk deer that had been sitting there.[33] The herbs near-by provided for the leader a lamp without oil by their lustre that glittered on the chains of the elephants which were stuck to the *Sarala* trees.[34] When he left the place which he had used as a camp, the marks on the *Devadāru* trees left by the elephants that rubbed their necks against them, indicated the size of such elephants. to the *Kirāta* tribes there.[35] That is the first time that Raghu saw a match for himself and the Himalayas also a match for him.[36] When the other people climb the mountain, the Himalayas never felt that some one was on it, and it was only when Raghu climbed the Himalayas that he felt that there was something on his way. Till then it was an easy walk-over for him. He finished off some other regions and after this March of Victory, Raghu returned to his country in triumph.

Raghu went along the whole extent of the country, both along the sea and the land border; there was not a single point in this long tour where KALIDASA did not introduce some aspect of Nature, and at the same time we do not miss the central point that he was on a March of Victory and not on a Holiday Tour. The march of a big army and the appreciation of the beauties of Nature are not easy to be brought into the same picture. But KALIDASA has succeeded in harmonising the two contradictory themes in the same description. That is the greatness of KALIDASA as a poet. I have seen elegant Nature poems; I have seen grand poems of heroism. But I have not seen the two twined together in the same context into a single poem. He has shown his powers as an artist in another context where the situation of grief at the death of the queen and the solitary life of the king at the close of the eighth Conto of the

Raghuvaṁśa, where the story of Aja ends, is converted into a situation of eternal joy and happiness in Heaven.

I can easily see the propriety of introducing Nature when Dilipa went to the hermitage of his teacher in the forest and when he lived in the forest attending on a cow, for many days. But it is difficult to think of a more inappropriate context for the description of Nature than the March of Victory undertaken by a king. Yet it is in such an unexpected context that KALIDASA succeeds in a description of Nature keeping up the spirit of the march of an immense army. The introduction of Nature even in such a context shows what a great love KALIDASA had for Nature, how the epic is about Nature and how the kings are only some sort of occasional pillars or walls for him to paint Nature. But when the kings become real characters in the poem, they discard their royal nature and become poets and admirers of Nature. That is why I always emphasise the point that KALIDASA wrote only about Nature as the real theme in his poetry and that men were mostly a technical necessity, a convenience in his art.

Dilipa, the dutiful king who sacrificed all comforts in life for the welfare of the people and Raghu the heroic king who brought unity in the whole country were both presented to us as poets who loved and appreciated Nature, who lived their life in the company of Nature. Now it is the turn of the third king Aja, who is introduced as living a full life; and in his case, Nature becomes quite appropriate. But what is most surprising is that this is the king who is least seen in the company of Nature. He is taken out of his own palace, just as in the case of his father and grand-father. But he was taken to another palace, the palace of the king of the Vidarbhas. Practically the entire story of Aja is centred round a palace, and there are only two small episodes that took place duriag his migration to the palace of the Vidarbhas and his return journey, both of them being full of heroism. Still KALIDASA is not silent about Nature even in this context. The description of Nature is centred round the heroine in this case. In the case of the hero, there is the mention of an elephant coming out of the river Nurbada when Aja was camping on its banks during his journey to the Vidarbha country, and Aja stopping the elephant with an arrow discharged in a mild way so that it would not kill the animal.[37] But for the description of the elephant, there is no real description of Nature. There is a description of the morning after Aja reaches the palace of the Vidarbhas. This is a very beautiful description and it has been the tradition that this is one of the best Nature descriptions in the works of KALIDASA. Though the description is beautiful, it loses all its value in so far as Aja is not really in communion with the Nature that is being described. He is in his bed in the morning and the bards are singing of that morning. Further, Nature description by the Court bards is conventional and has little life in it. It is in this sense that I have stated earlier that Aja is not the centre for any description of Nature by KALIDASA as in the case of the two kings that have gone before.

KALIDASA's love of Nature is seen in the description of the kings of the various countries who had assembled for the wedding, each one of them hoping that he would be chosen by the heroine as her husband. Here again we find KALIDASA introducing Nature in a context where we least expect it. There is a description of the various kings, so that the heroine could know something about the suitors; and what we naturally expect is that there would be a glorification of the royal power and splendour and luxury that the heroine would be able to enjoy in the court of the various kings. But we see nothing of the palaces and the splendour in the palaces. If the heroine chooses the king of the Angas, she would be a fit companion for the wealth and the learning that are already in the king.[38] Here it is not at all meant that there would be enough of wealth in the court of the king; what is emphasised is that wealth exists along with learning, a very rare combination. In the case of the Avanti king, there is the temple of Mahakala and in so far as there is the moon on the forehead of the Deity, there would be moon-light even in the dark half of the month. And this eternal moon-light is a great factor in her enjoyment in that city, because there would be also rows of gardens where the wind would be shaking the trees after they had become cool though contact with the waves in the river Sipra.[39] In the case of the king of Anupa, there is the river Reva (Nurbada) which winds round the city of Mahishmati like a girdle and the rows of mansions would be reflected in its winding waters.[40] If she chooses the king of the Surasenas, there is the Kalindi river (Jumna) which has its dark waters made white with the sandal-paste washed into the waters of the river when the ladies of the palace have their water-sports there, which river would appear to have been united to the Ganges on this account though it is far higher up near Mathura.[41] She would be able, further, to enjoy her youth in the Vrindavana, which even excels the celestial garden, where there are beds of grass with very tender leaves.[42] Not only this, in the rainy season, she can see the dances of the pea-cocks, sitting on the rocks in the charming caves of the Govardhana mountains, when the rocks are wet with the drops of waters from the new clouds, and also are covered with moss.[43] In the Kalinga country, the sound of the waves from the nearby ocean would wake her up in the morning from her sleep, which could be seen through the windows, and the sound of the waves are deeper than the drums which usually wake up kings.[44] In the company of that king, she can live in the mansions close to the ocean, where there would be the rustling sound of the palm-trees, and the perspiration on her body would be dried up by the breeze that is fragrant with cloves brought from far off islands.[45] In the Pandya kingdom she would be a co-wife to the southern region that is surrounded by the ocean where various gems are found scattered; [46] she can enjoy life in the vast areas near to the Malaya mountains, where there are the areca-nut trees on which the betal-creepers wind round, where there are the sandal-wood trees embraced by the cardamom creepers, where the whole place is covered by the leaves of the *Tamāla* trees.[47]

These are the various descriptions of the kings assembled in the wedding hall. I do not at all conceal the fact that in this description there is ample mention of the prowess and wealth and splendour of the kings and their palaces. But the position is that after such a description of the king, the guide says at the end that if she chooses that king, she will be able to enjoy such and such an aspect of Nature- The idea seems to be that whatever kingly qualities they may have, not one of them was worthy of her, and the only things that deserved her company in those places were the various beautiful aspects of Nature. The heroine also did not choose any one of them. When the heroine approached the kings and passed them on, there is the description; "Like a moving torch at night, as she passed the various kings in turn, when she was trying to choose a companion, the kings looked like the mansions in the streets, changing their colour."[48] (KALIDASA is known as *Dīpaśikhā* KALIDASA or KALIDASA of the torch fame, for this comparison).

After the wedding the prince went back to his own kingdom and the king Raghu bestowed the whole kingdom on him and retired to a neighbouring garden for penance, available when any need might arise for his help in the kingdom. Later, the father died and the son was ruling the country well. It was at this stage that one day when the king and the queen were in the garden, a garland fell down from the sky on the body of the queen and suddenly she fell dead. The king was full of grief at this unexpected loss and there is a description of how he wept over his misfortune. It is here that Nature comes to play its part in the story of Aja. It showed its sympathy for the king in his bereavement. "The birds living in the lotus-pond also cried as if with sympathy in a common sorrow, being frightened with the tumultuous wailings of grief from the attendants of both of them."[49] Even this is a very brief association of Nature with the king.

It will be found that, of the three dramas of KALIDASA, two deal with themes taken from the epics[50] while the third deals with a historical theme[51] (contemporanous with the author himself as is very likely.) In this historical drama also there is no sign of Nature playing any part. That drama has its scene in the palace, and KALIDASA never associates

Nature with a palace. Aja too had his life in the palace, so far as it is dealt with in the epic. And that may be the reason why KALIDASA did not introduce any element of Nature in describing this prince. At the same time, Aja, like Agnimitra, the hero of the *Mālavikāgnimitra*, is presented as a really lovable person, even an object of admiration for the author. I have always noticed a sort of close affinity between Aja in the *Raghuvaṁśa* and Agnimitra in the *Mālavikāgaimitra*. The explanation for this dissociation of Nature from KALIDASA's favourites may be that KALIDASA did not want to associate Nature with a palace, and at the same time, he did not want it to be understood that real beauty in life is only in a forest, or anywhere outside a palace. I will show in a subsequent lecture that KALIDASA wanted to exalt life on earth as superior to life in Heaven; and on earth, life in company with Nature is the real life where one enjoys the beauty of Nature. But he wanted at the same to show that life in the palace, even without Nature, has its own attractive features. Whatever the explanation, one thing is certain and that is that the *Raghuvaṁśa* is more a poem about Nature than an epic about kings.

Of the three dramas, the *Śākuntala* is the work dealing with Nature in a far more prominent way than with the hero and the heroine. In this drama also, as in the case of the first two kings of the *Raghuvaṁśa* we find the king in the forest, and we know practically nothing about his palace until the story proceeds far. King Dushyanta, the hero of the drama, went out on a hunting, and chasing an antilope, he reached the entrance to the hermitage of the great sage Kanva; it was found that the antilope that he was chasing belonged to the hermitage. An antilope plays a very prominent role in the plot of the drama, appearing later.[52] Perhaps it is the same antilope. The sage himself was not present in the hermitage, but his foster-daughter was in charge of receiving the guests. The king saw her in the company of two friends, all engaged in watering the trees and plants and creepers in the garden. He preferred to watch them and so he concealed himself behind a tree, instead of presenting himself to them. In the conversation among the three maidens, we find what a part Nature plays in the drama; Nature is not a decoration, not a back-ground in the drama. Nature is as much among the characters of the drama as, rather is more important than, the human characters. The king found the beauty of a maiden grown up in the forest hermitage far more enchanting than that of maidens in the palace, whom he had known previously. He says about the heroine: "If the form of this person, living in the forest hermitage, is rare to be found in the palace, certainly, from the point of view of beauty, the creepers in the gardens are thrown far off by the creepers in the forest."[53] However much a flowering creeper may be attended to in a garden, it can never get the natural beauty of a creeper in a forest, and it is the same with the maidens in the natural surroundings of a forest, being far superior in beauty to the maidens in the palace. Here follows a conversation among Sakuntala and her two companions: [54]

Anasuya: Dear Sakuntala, I feel that the trees in the hermitage are far dearer to your father than yourself; because you too, more tender than the flowers of the *Navamālikā* creeper, have been employed in filling the base of the trees with water.

Sakuntala: It is not merely as a command from the father. To me too there is a fraternal love for them. This *Kesara* tree seems to be inviting me with his fingers in the form of the tender leaves shaken by the wind. So I will greet him.

Priyamvada: Dear Sakuntala, Just continue to remain in the same position for a moment.

Sakuntala: Why should I ?

Priyamvada: Because united with you, this *Kesara* tree appears to have been joined to a creeper.

Sakuntala: It is for this reason that you are known as *Priyaṁvadā* (one who talks sweet things)

Anasuya: Dear Sakuntala, this *Navamālikā* creeper, which has by itself chosen the young *Sahakāra* tree as a companion, and for which you have given the name *Vanajyotsnā* (Forest moon-light), you seem to have forgotten her.

Sakuntala: It can be so, if I can forget myself. It is in a charming age that the union has taken place between this pair, the creeper and the tree; for the *Vanajyotsnā* is young with fresh flowers and the young *Sahakāra* is able to enjoy life, being filled with the tender leaves.

Priyamvada: Dear Anasuya, do you know why Sakuntala is looking at the *Vanajyotsnā* with so much attention?

Anasuya: I cannot imagine; what is it?

Priyamvada: Just as this *Vanajyotsnā* has been united to a suitable tree as mate, how she can herself secure a husband suitable to her.

Sakuntala: Indeed this must be the longing in your own mind.

This is the context into which we find the King introduced in the *Śākuntala* for the first time. And we find the hero a really lovable man, simple in manners, informal and unassuming. When he reached the gates of the hermitage, he understood that the great sage was not there and that his daughter was there in charge of receiving the guests, and as any simpleton will do, he says: "It does not matter; I will meet her. She will communicate my respect to the sage herself."[55] In the way in which it is put, there is a hint in the words, that he is happy over the fact that she was alone and that the old sage was not there. Instead of entering the hermitage, he conceals himself behind a tree to look at the girls who were watering the garden. In the course of the above conversation, a bee comes out of a creeper, and Sakuntala cries out to the companions to come to her help. Then the king finds this the most opportune time to reveal himself under pretext of doing the noblest thing in the world, namely, to protect the maidens in the hermitage from the attack of some wicked person. When they all meet, he says about a formal reception: "By the sweet words of you all, the reception to be accorded to a guest has been amply given."[56] He considered their company and conversation with them far more enjoyable than a formal reception worthy of a royal guest. When at a later stage Priyamvada taunted her too much and Sakuntala was about to go, Priyamvada tells her that she should not go until she had paid her due, in the form of watering two trees which she had done on her behalf, and then the king, just like a simple fool, offers to release her from her debt by giving his ring [57] instead, as a price. It is the same king who became very particular about all the formalities and all the decorum in the matter of receiving the visitors from the hermitage, when Sakuntala was sent over there by her father with a proper escort. [58] He is a lovable simpleton in the forest surrounded by Nature, and he is a stiff king on the throne in the palace.

It is in the fourth Act of the *Śākuntala* that we find the art of KALIDASA rising to its maximum height of charm. In the first and third Acts, we saw the king and the heroine and her two companions together in the forest hermitage, and here we find the art also to its great advantage. But we see the same scenery without the king, and here the great sage appears, the only scene in which he makes his appearance on the stage in the whole drama. The hero had married the heroine and left the hermitage with a promise to send suitable escorts to take the heroine to the palace; yet on account of a curse, the king had forgotten all about the events in the hermitage. But the sage, the foster-father of the heroine, had come back to the hermitage and he was very happy to hear about the marriage; he decided to send her to the king himself, and the chief interest in the scene is the way in which Sakuntala takes leave of her companions in the forest, of whom the trees and the animals and the birds form the most intimate.

The Prologue to the Act opens with the companions of Sakuntala collecting flowers for the use at the daily worship in the hermitage. Then one of the disciples of the sage describes the early morning-time when the moon was going down and the sun was rising. The arrangements for the journey are taken up, and one of the companions of Sakuntala says that she had already prepared a garland made of *Kesara* flowers, and that she had kept it in a cocoa-nut shell and deposited it in the branch of a mango tree; the companions take it and hurry to the place where all the other people had assembled for the occasion, to bless the heroine and to take leave of her. The trees also make rich presents of ornaments and silk robes, and they were really provided by the forest nymphs who showed their respect to the sage with such rich presents.[59]

In what is termed Nature, there are two sides; one side is represented by the trees and the rivers and the animals and other things and the other side is represented by forest nymphs and other supernatural objects. Here in the fourth Act of the *Śākuntala* we find a combination of both; the same was seen in the *Raghuvaṁśa* when Dilipa went to the forest to attend on a cow, and there among other things, he heard his own glories being sung by the forest nymphs sitting in the bowers of creepers.[60] In the *Śākuntala*, the disciples of the great sage went to the forest to collect some flowers and other articles to prepare ornaments for Sakuntala when she was to go to the house of her newly married husband; that was an occasion for great rejoicing for the inmates there and even the forest nymphs took part in it. They felt that for such an occasion some garlands of flowers would not be enough as ornaments for Sakuntala, and they gave various silk robes and ornaments and articles of decoration for the face and the feet and the fingers through the trees. They could see the hands of the forest nymphs up to the elbow, letting down the articles from the trees.[61] Not only the inmates of the hermitage, the forest trees and the nymphs too participated in the festivity.

Then the great Sage, Kanva enters for the purpose of giving a send off to Sakuntala with an escort. The first objects to which the sage addressed on this occasion were the trees on which the forest nymphs were also living. He said: "When in the morning you have not received your share of water, she does not think of sipping even a drop of water; she is very fond of decorating her body and yet she does not pluck out even a single tender leaf from you out of love for you; when the first flowers appear on you, that is the occasion for the greatest festivity for her. Here, this Sakuntala is now going to the home of her husband; may all of you give her your permission."[62] Through the voice of birds sitting on the trees and cooing, the trees expressed their consent to the departure of Sakuntala.[63] There was also the word of benediction heard from above: "May your path be charming all along with lotus ponds full of golden flowers, up to the destination, with shady trees that make the heat of the sun bearable, with soft dust made of the pollen of the lotus flowers and with wind mild and favourable, and in this way promising fortune to you."[64]

Sakuntala was very eager to reach the home of her royal husband and to see him; and yet her feet would not move forward on account of her grief at the separation from the penance-grove in which she had spent all her life.[65] But her companion, Priyamvada said that it was not merely Sakuntala that experienced such a grief at that searation from the penance grove; the penance grove too, had the same grief on account of that approaching separation. See—"The antilopes spit out the balls of *Darbha* grass which they have started eating; the peacocks have left off their dance; the white leaves dropping from the creepers look like tears falling from their eyes."[66] Here starts the leave taking of Sakuntala from the objects in the hermitage.

Sakuntala: Father, now I will take leave of the *Vanajyotsnā*[67] which is a sister to me in the form of a creeper.

Sage : I know what fraternal love you bear for it; here it is on your right side.

Sakuntala: Dear *Vanajyotsnā*, although you are united to the mango tree,[68] return me this embrace with your hands in the form of the branches drooping off on this side. From now onwards I will have to live far away from you.[69]

Sage : Even from the beginning I have been thinking of a husband for you, and you have been united to the same person, who is worthy of yourself on account of your good luck. This *Navamālikā* creeper too has been united to a mango tree. Now I have no more worry about this creeper and also about you.[70]

Sakuntala: Now I leave these two in your hands.

The Two Companions: In whose hands will you now leave this person? (They shed tears).

Sakuntala: Father, when this deer that wanders around the hermitage[71] with prognancy far advanced, will deliver a young with safety, then kindly send me some one to intimate to me the glad news.

Sage: It will be so; I shall not forget it.

Sakuntala: What is it that is catching my robes again and again? (She turns round).

Sage: Child—This young deer will not leave off your path, which you had adopted as a son, in whose mouth that was hurt with the needle point of the *Kuśa* grass, you poured the *Iṅgudī* oil to cure the wound and which had been brought up by you with great care by giving it handfuls of *Śyāmāka* grain. [72]

Sakuntala: Child, why do you follow me when I am terminating my life with you in this place? When your mother died soon after you were born, you were brought up without a mother. Father will think of you now when you are separated from me. Now you retire. (She weeps and starts)

Sakuntala: (to herself) This female in the *Cakrāvāka*[73] pair cries because she is not able to see her mate who has been hidden by the leaves of the lotus, here on the right. I am putting up with something that is difficult to put up with.

In this context, we have a scene situated in the same place where the incidents of the first three Acts of the drama also took place; but we find ourselves in a different atmosphere. Earlier, it was a more jovial environment that we saw with the frolicsome Priyamvada and the simpleton king and the rather baffled heroine, to which there is an element of seriousness added by the presence of the other companion of the heroine, Anasuya. It does not mean that the companion Priyamvada did not have sincerity nor that Anasuya did not have a soft side in her nature. Still if Priyamvada was not there, the scene would have been too heavy with seriousness, and if Anasuya had not been there, the scene would have been too light with jokes. Sakuntala had some new experiences of which she had no taste at any earlier time in her life, and she wanted to conceal it and to pretend that she was the same foster-daughter of the greate sage, full of a sense of duty without being detracted by any personal cosiderations. The king, normally accustomed to the formalities and ceremonies of the court, is now in the presence of persons to whom he was not accustomed; he wanted to be familiar and put on an air of being quite at home in their company, which he really was not, and the jokes of Priyamvada adds to the humourous situation. The four characters, each distinct from the other, are blended into a mild, calm and quiet environment of trees and creepers and flowers and brooks and birds and animals.

When we come to the fourth Act, we find ourselves in the same place, in a different environment. The king has gone back to his palace; Sakuntala has become a responsible young lady, expecting a baby after her marriage. She knows that she has to leave off the old environments and the old ways of life and that she has to spend the rest of her life in the royal palace as a queen. There was no conflict in her, except the conflict of the love for the home where she had grown up, and the necessity to leave it off which brought about sorrow at separation from things that had been dear to her. But she had nothing to conceal, and she did not have to put on an air of composure when her mind was agitated with new feelings. Priyamvada also has shed her jokes. The great sage has come to the scene, and along with him appeared also some supernatural elements in the environment, like the forest nymphs. Here it is all seriousness. The calmness of the situation changed from mildness to serenity, in the forest hermitage. We find ourselves in the grand aspects of Nature.

This scene of separation from the forest hermitage and the leave-taking in the *Śākuntala* may be compared with the scene in Schiller's *Jungfrau von Orleans* (*Maid of Orleans*), where Joan takes leave of her village and the neighbourhood when she had to go away to lead an army in battle:

Farewell, you hills, you beloved pastures,
You homely, silent dales, farewell.

Joan will now no longer wander over you.
Joan says farewell to you for ever.

You meadows which I have watered, you trees
which I have planted, grow you up green. . . .

Farewell, you grottos and you cool fountains
You echos, the gracious voices of these dales,
Which often gave me response to my songs,
Joan is going, and she never turns back.

You, abode of all my still joys,
I leave you behind me for ever.
Scatter yourself, you lambs, on the heaths,
You have now become a flock without a shepherd.
Now must I another flock tend.

In the whole of the *Raghuvaṁśa* and the *Meghadūta,* except the description of the Himalayas during Raghu's march of victory, we find ourselves in the milder aspects of Nature. In the earlier parts of the *Śākuntala* also, we are in a similar mild environment. Usually it is held that KALIDASA excels in the description of the mild forms of Nature and that we do not come across the grand aspects of Nature to the same extent, like mountains and thick forests and mighty rivers with their torrents, and the dark nights and storms. But in the *Śākuntala* itself KALIDASA has shown how he is a master in the description of the grand forms of Nature, and the same we saw in the description of the Himalayas in the March of Victory undertaken by Raghu in the *Raghuvaṁśa.*[74] In the final Act of the *Śākuntala,* we again find ourselves on the top of the Himalayas, where there is the hermitage of another great sage, Maricha where the hero and the heroine are united again.

The real description of a grand scenery is in the *Kumārasambhava,* where the beginning is the description of the Himalayas, as a divinity and also as the king of the mountains.[75] We find ourselves lifted far above the earth, and we see little of human beings in such heights. There are the red coloured minerals which the celestial damsels, the *Apsaras,* use for their decorations on the body.[76] The highest clouds reach up only to the sides of the mountain and there the *Siddhas* (a kind of semi-celestial beings) go below such clouds and enjoy the shades and when the rain comes, being disturbed by the torrent, they ascend to the tops of peaks and enjoy the sun there.[77] The *Kirātas* chase the lions, and the snow removes the foot-prints of such lions, and they are not able to identify the path of the lions. Then when they see the pearls that had dropped from the nails of the lions, scattered on the snow since the lions had killed the elephants, they are able to detect such paths and they continue the chase.[78] The *Vidyādhara* damsels tear out the bark of the *Bhūrja* trees and they utilise them to write their love letters marking the letters with the coloured minerals on the mountin.[79] When the wind blows, it fills the holes on the bamboo trees, and the bamboos make a wistling sound, which look like the flute that keeps the tune in the music performance of the *Kinnara* maidens.[80] The elephants rub their cheeks against the *Sarala* trees on the tops and the juice shed by the trees drop down and make even the valleys fragrant.[81] The forest dwellers live in the caves of the mountain along with their women, and the lights emanating from the herbs reach up to the inside of such caves and become lamps at night without oils to burn, which they could enjoy.[82] The thick snow had become hard like rocks and another kind of semi-celestial damsels (who have their face like those of horses), with their very heavy waists, do not make their slow movements along the snow faster, though the cold gave pain to their toes and their heels.[83] Even by day time there was darkness in the caves of the mountain, and it looked as if the mountain was offering refuge to the darkness that was afraid of the sun and that was hiding in the caves.[84] The female *Camari* deer wave this side and that side their thick tails that shine like moon-light and they seem thereby to be making literally true the epithet of the mountain as the king of mountains.[85] In some caves were living *Kimpuruṣas* (another variety of semi-celestial beings) both male and female, and when the males pulled off the clothes of the females, the latter became very shy; but the water clouds that came to the mouth of the caves acted like screens for the entrance.[86] When the *Kirātas* hunt the animals, they get fatigued and they enjoy the breeze that bore the cool drops from the torrent of the Ganges, which shook the *Devadāru* trees and which prampted the peacocks to spread out their feathers.[87]

Here is a grand description of the Himalayas. The immense heights and the majesty and impressiveness of the great mountain range are clearly presented to us. It cannot be said that KALIDASA had any special preference to the milder aspects of Nature or that he did not have the ability to describe the grand aspects of Nature with the same effectiveness. Whatever the aspect, he is a master of graphic description. KALIDASA never described Nature as a result of any erudiction received from study at a desk; he saw Nature and he loved Nature and the whole description comes from his heart.

As I have already said, there is nothing that can be called a description of Nature in the *Mālavikāgnimitra* where the scenes are placed in a palace, and KALIDASA never associates Nature with a palace. In the other drama the *Vikramorvaśīya* also, there is no description of Nature, and the scenes are also placed in the palace for the most part. There is but one Act, the fourth one, which is nothing but a description of Nature. The heroine leaves the king all on a sudden, and the king goes out and asks the various objects of Nature whether any of them had seen the heroine. Here there is a mono-actor scene where only the king appears. I will deal with the importance of this scene when I deal with the problem of earth and heaven in KALIDASA. There too, it is a fine description and can find a place in this context. But I put off the scene for a future occasion.

It is only in the veda and in the *Mahābhārata* and in the *Rāmāyaṇa* that we find the same intimacy of man with Nature which we find in the works of KALIDASA. There are practically few contexts in the works of KALIDASA where Nature does not come in as an important factor, and in many places, Nature plays a far more important rolè in the poem than the human characters themselves. We see Nature even in contexts where we least expect it, and in such cases also, we find that KALIDASA introduces Nature without any strain or any mark of inconsistency. KALIDASA infuses life into the objects of Nature and all of them have feelings of joy and grief; they have sympathies with man in his sorrows and joys.

HEAVEN AND EARTH

There is a very beautiful description of Heaven in the *Ṛgveda;*[1] although it has been mentioned and cited when the culture of the Vedas was considered in another context, it is worth-while to cite it here since it is so very beautiful and so full of significance to understand the culture of ancient India.

> Where the poet (Brahma), the purifier, uttering the words of songs remains in eminence when the Soma is pressed producing bliss through that Soma,
>
> Where there is eternal light, where in that region the heaven is established, there in that immortal world that will not perish, hold me on, O purifier,
>
> Where the son of Vivasvat (Yama)[2] is the ruler, where is the threshold to the heaven,[3] where there are those young waters, there make me immortal.
>
> Where movement is according to one's will, in the threefold region, in the third division of the Heaven, where the worlds are full of lustre, there make me immortal.
>
> Where are wishes and longings fulfulled, where is the seat of the Sun-god, where there is food and satisfaction, there make me immortal.
>
> Where there are bliss and enjoyment and happiness and intense joys, where the objects of all desires are satisfied,[4] there make me immortal.

In this song about the Heaven beyond this world, there is clearly a longing for eternal life in that farther region. This is in common with what is found in all the religions. Every religion teaches a region beyond this world in which we live, where there is eternal happiness for man. But what is distinctive of the religion of the Veda is that there is no corresponding longing in the teachers of the religion for an *escape* from this world. Therefore, to the Vedic people the happiness in heaven is only a continuation of the happiness in this world and not an escape from the sufferings in this world. In this song, what we see is a *poetic* glorification of the happiness in Heaven, and a touch of exaggeration is inevitable in such a poetic description. Therefore this eagerness for permanency in that region of perfect happiness need not be taken as a hint about the apparent happiness in the world in which we live being impermanent and not worth longing for. It is not suggested that the experience in this world is only a necessity and not a choice in man's life. We cannot ignore the fact that there are prayers coming in the Vedic songs, over and over again, to enable the people to complete the full span of life on earth allotted to them. Again and again, the poets sing to the gods praying them not to deprive them of any portion of their life.

What differentiates the religion of the Veda from the latter-day religion in India is this attitude towards the experience of man on this earth, and not so much the views regarding the happiness in heaven. But in course of time, there came about a great change in the metter of man's attitude in India towards the life on this earth and the future life beyond of this earth and the relative happiness in the two kinds of life. It became an article of faith in Indian religion that there is no real happiness *on earth* and that true happiness is possible for man only when he can *escape from this world*. There may be some element of enjoyment in the experience of man on earth; but that is not true happiness, in so far as that is associated with suffering, that is not permanent and there is a gradation in such enjoyments.

Beyond this world, there is either heaven or there is complete cessation of any kind of life, what is called beatitude, *Mokṣa*. Life in heaven continued to be an object of longing and men strove for it through various acts of piety and through abstinence from acts that are prohibited as being against the religious principles even when philosophers asserted that heaven too is not a real goal for man, in so far as there is no *perfect* happiness in heaven either. There too there is the element of impermanency in the happiness. An aversion towards life on earth became a common feature in all religious beliefs of India. Man wanted to escape from this world, whether such an escape is to heaven or to *Mokṣa*.

The revival of the Vedic thoughts is a reaction against this anti-worldly attitude of religion that grew up in India. The great importance that is, and that should be, attached to the problems of life on earth, is emphasised without any equivocation or reserve in this revival. Heaven and *Mokṣa* are reduced to a very subordinate position, in estimating the values in life. There is the general mention of the four-fold goal of man, namely, *Dharma*, *Artha*, *Kāma*[5] and *Mokṣa* and the last is also spoken of as the supreme goal (*Parama-puruṣārtha*). But in the texts that are closely related to the revival of the Vedic ways of life, they speak only of three goals in life, *Dharma*, *Artha* and *Kāma*, and they call it the three-fold path (the *Trivarga*). The texts that relate to the revival of the Vedic way of life in India are the *Mahābhārata* and the *Rāmāyaṇa*; and the works of KALIDASA form the most important contribution among what is called secular poetry; the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Mahābhārata* are taken as having a religious colour in them. KALIDASA's attitude towards the Values in life, whether it is four-fold including *Mokṣa* or whether it is three-fold, consisting of only *Dharma* and *Artha* and *Kāma*, is the same as that taken up in the *Mahābhārata* and in the *Rāmāyāṇa*.

Not only does KALIDASA not attach any importance to Heaven and *Mokṣa* in his scheme of life, he seems even to belittle their importance in his poetry. This is an aggressive reaction against the religion that had invaded India and that had suppressed the Vedic way of life for some time; and KALIDASA deliberately describes Heaven as something far lesser than the Earth as a place for noble and happy life. There is no mention, in the case of most of the characters that are introduced in his poetry, about the goal which they kept in view in their work or what happened to them ultimately. In the three dramas, the hero lives in happiness at the end of the story. In the *Mālavikāgnimitra*, Agnimitra marries Malavika and they live in happiness after the triumph in the political field also. In the *Vikramorvaśīya*, Indra sends a message to the hero asking him to continue his life on earth, instead of retiring to the forest, and to enjoy the company of the heroine also as long as he lives. In the *Śākuntala* the king rejoins the heroine after their separation and both of them return to the city from the hermitage where they met, to live there in happiness. We do not know when they died and what happened to them after their death. In the *Vikramorvaśīya*, where Indra asks the hero to continue his life on earth, all that he says is, as reported by Narada:[6] "Here is an instruction from Indra, who knows your progress, when he understood you to be thinking of retiring to the forest—A war between the gods and the demons has been prophesied by the sages who know the past, the present and the future. And you are our help in times of war. Therefore you shall not put down your weapons. And this Urvasi will be your companion as long as you live," Here there is no hint or invitation to go to Heaven for lasting happiness after he finishes his work in the world.

In the *Raghuvaṁśa*, we do not know either, what happened to the first king. About Dilipa it is said: "Then he along with the queen, resorted to the shades in the forest where the sages perform penance, when his mind began to get disinterested in the affairs of the world, after he according to prescriptions, gave his young son the umbrella which is the exalted symbol of royalty."[7] We hear nothing more of him. KALIDASA makes a general remark that such is the family tradition of the kings of the *Ikṣvāku*[8] dynasty. What is stated about Raghu may be interpreted to mean the attainment of *mokṣa*. The words are: "After spending some years with a mind of equanimity out of consideration for his son Aja, Raghu attained to the *Puruṣa* that is free from destruction and that transcends darkness, through his Yogic contemplation." [9] I will consider in the next lecture what this actually means; one thing is certain, and that is that he did not go to the Heaven. In the case of Aja, it is definitely said that he went to heaven and continued the happy life which was terminated on the earth through the accidental death of the queen. Here there is no indication that he escaped from this world to heaven where alone he could have the real happiness.[10] It was a prolongation of the happiness on earth, in the Heaven also.

When the queen passed away, the king was full of grief on account of the break in his happiness in the company of the queen. "On account of the son being only a boy, he spent eight more years with great difficulty, looking at things that had some resemblance to her and also at her portraits and securing some momentary union with her in dream."[11] "His grief forcibly cut into his heart like the growth of a banyan tree into a mansion. But soon he considered it as a gain in so far as it would lead to his following his belowed, through the cause of his life's end, impossible for the physicians to cure[12]." "The king decided to resort to a vow of courting death, because he wanted to leave off the body that had become the unhappy abode of diseases, after establishing his son for the protection of the nation, who had been properly trained for it."[13] Then it is said that he went to heaven after throwing off his body on the confluence of the Sarayu with the Ganges, and being reunited with his beloved, he enjoyed his life in full in the mansions in the celestial gardens[14]. The commentators say that the grief ended in diseases that physicians could not cure. There is no need to make such an interpretation. There are certain diseases that can be cured by physicians and there are other ailments of a mental nature for which there are no antidotes. They are the maladies like intense attachment to the pleasures of this world and grief arising out of the loss of chances to realise the objects of such attachments. They are what are refered to in the beginning of the *Aṣṭāṅga-Hṛdaya*, the standard work on medicine, namely, diseases like *Rāga* (intense attachment). The king knew that his attachment to the queen was very intense and therefore his grief would end his life; he continued his life out of a sense of duty to the country, in so far as his son who could take his place on the throne, was still a boy. There is no possibility of a recovery from his grief. And when he dies, he knew that he could go to heaven where he would be reunited to the queen who was already dead. So he waited till the son was able to take up the burden of the government of the country. Then he placed him on the throne and going to the confluence of the Sarayu river with the Ganges, he sat there prepared to meet his death through the prescribed process of *Prāyopaveśana* (sitting somewhere without food and in Yogic contemplation inviting death). It had been said in the description of the kings of the Raghu dynasty that they left off their body at the end of their life through Yogic powers.[15]

KALIDASA deliniated three characters, representing respectively the three values in life, namely, *Dharma*, *Artha* and *Kāma*. Nothing is said about Dilipa who represented *Dharma* regarding his ultimate destination. He retired to the forest, and there ends the story about him. Raghu represented *Artha*, and he finally reached the ultimate self after his death through his Yogic powers. Happiness in Heaven in continuation of a happy life on earth is destined for Aja who led a full life of enjoyment associated with heroism on earth. The idea behind must be that a full life with enjoyment in it is not prejudicial to the final goal of reaching Heaven. Not only this, a full life on earth is the right way to a continued happiness beyond, after death also.

Heaven in itself is not a place to be sought after. Heaven is gained by man as a result of a full life on earth. Heaven is not attained by acts meant for escape from the earth. Heaven is not either such a wonderful and rare place to be the object of any intense longing on our part. This is what is again and again indicated through various points introduced in the *Raghuvaṁśa*.

The first king Dilipa was always going to the Heaven to meet the king of Heaven, and it was during some such visit that he failed to show due respect to the Celestial Cow, and this resulted in his being denied a son until the king propitiated the daughter of that cow.[16] Raghu, the son of Dilipa, was as mighty as the King of the Heaven himself.[17] In point of virtue also, the people in Heaven and their king are not better than the people of the earth and their kings, and the latter are even on a higher plane. Dilipa wanted to perform one more sacrifice, which would make the total number of sacrifices performed by him full one hundred; the King of Heaven is the only person who had done this before and he did not want a rival to this title of "having performed one hundred sacrifices." On account of this jealousy, the King of Heaven stole the horse that had been let loose by Dilipa, though many warriors under the command of Raghu had been sent in charge of the safety of the horse. Knowing him to be the King of Heaven Raghu said to him: "You are spoken of as the foremost among those who partake of the offerings at sacrifices; how is it that you are now trying to bring about an obstacle to the performance of a sacrifice by my father?"[18] "You are able to see things that are beyond the sight of ordinary people, and you are also the lord of the three worlds. Those who bring obstacles to sacrifices are to be brought under proper discipline by you. If such a person himself now brings about obstacles in the path of those who want to perform sacrifices, then Providence has dropped down."[19] "Hearing such dignified words of Raghu, the king of the Heaven turned his chariot back with wonder and started giving a reply."[20] "O prince, what you have said is true; but fame has to be protected against rivals by those whose wealth is fame. Your father has started on breaking such a fame of mine known in the whole world, through this sacrifice."[21] This is the reason why he took away the horse. "Then with a smile, the protector of the horse said to the king of the Heaven again—if that is your decision, you may take these weapons. Indeed you will not be able to have your own way until you have vanquished Raghu."[22] "Saying thus to the king of the Heaven he put the arrows on his bow, and stood looking upwards.'[23] "Even the king of the Heaven, infuriated with the arrows of Raghu which struck his chest and stunned him, fixed on his bow an arrow that will not fail its victim."[24] "That arrow which really deserved to drink only the blood of the terrible demons, entered the chest of the son of Dilipa and drank the human blood which it has never tasted before, with some seeming wonder."[25] "The prince too struck an arrow marked with his own name on the hand of the king of the Heaven, the fingers of which are hard with striking the head of the celestial elephant, and which itself was fond of being smeared with the sandal paste from the breast of the celestial queen[26]." "With another arrow that was decorated with peacock feathers, Raghu cut down the chariot's flag staff of the enemy, that was big; he was terribly infuriated at Raghu, as if the latter had pulled down the braided hair from the head of the maiden in the form of the splendour of heaven[27]." Then there was a terrible battle between the two, Raghu with his arrows being discharged upwards and the king of Heaven being able to throw the arrows downwards."[28] The king of the Heaven was not able to withstand or to resist the flood of arrows from Raghu.[29] "Then Raghu cut the string of the bow of the king of the Heaven which was making in his hands that had been decorated with red sandals a twang resembling the deep roar of the ocean when it was agitated, using an arrow that had a head like a crescent moon[30]." "He put down his bow, and becoming very impatient decided to kill the enemy who had exhibited so much power, and for that purpose he took up a weapon that was appropriate only to cut the wings of the mountains[31]." With that weapon, Raghu was compelled to fall down; but in a moment he was up again on his feet[32]." The king of the Heaven was immensely pleased with him for his surpassing valour though he stood in the position of an enemy discharging deadly weapons against himself. He told the young prince that no one till that time had stood against his weapons and asked him to choose anything except the horse[33]. At that time Raghu had half drawn out an arrow; but since it is against the rule of war to discharge a weapon against an enemy who was also not discharging his weapons, he withdrew that arrow and told the king of heaven thus[34]: "If you think that you cannot let off the horse, then let my father enjoy the fruits of the sacrifice if he would have finished it according to the prescribed formalities[35]."

Here we find the Heaven and the earth put one against the other. There is a young prince on earth and the ancient king of the Heaven above. It may be that KALIDASA took the incident from some well-known source which is now lost to us; what is peculiar in this context, is the colour which the poet gives to the picture. The hand of the king of heavens is described as what the sandal-paste decoration on the breast of his queen was coveting and also as adorned with red sandal pastes. The weapons that he was discharging were fit against the powerful demons or for cutting the wings of the mountains,[36] and yet Raghu withstood them all. The King of the Heavens is associated with women and with decorations, and the young prince on earth is associated with valour and courage and indomitable heroism comparable with the great God Siva with his bow. It is this presentation more than the situation that is important for us. KALIDASA wants to show that Heaven is not at all superior to the earth. Raghu was up against his enemy for a great and noble cause, and the enemy came against him with base traits like jealousy and with lowly actions likes stealing.

There are various situations in the works of KALIDASA where the poet introduces the jealousy of the King of the Heaven and the superior valour and power of the kings on earth. Indumati whom Aja married, was originally a celestial damsel and the King of the Heavens sent her to entice a sage who was performing some penance to attain spiritual elevation.[37] Just as the King of the Heaven was jealous of king Dilipa on earth and even stole his sacrificial horse to obstruct such a great religious act, the same King of the Heaven did not want that a human being should acquire spiritual elevation through severe penance. In the *Śākuntala*, when the companions of the heroine were describing how she was really the daughter of a great sage named Visvamitra through the celestial damsel Menaka, they had to tell the hero how the King of the Heaven was very jealous of the powers which the sage Visvamitra might acquire through his penance and how he sent the celestial Menaka to entice him from his vows, the result being the birth of a bady, the heroine of the drama.[38] There, there is a statement by the king also that it is well-known how jealous the King of the Heaven is regarding the powers which human beings acquire through penance.[39] In contrast to this, not a single human hero introduced into the poems is described as guilty of such base motives. There is only nobility in them; they may have weaknesses which evoke our sympathy, but not our aversion. It is only in the case of the King of Heaven that there are introduced jealousy and other lowly feelings which evoke our sense of contempt for him. And the king of Heaven is never presented to us by KALIDASA as a noble character comparable to the human heroes.

The surpassing valour and power exhibited by the heroes on earth as exemplified by Raghu, is again and again presented to us in various contexts. In the *Śākuntala,* two disciples from the hermitage of the sage approach the king when he was in the neighbourhood of the hermitage during his hunting expeditions, and one of them says of the king: "There is no room for wonder in that this king, single-handed rules over the whole earth having the dark ocean as the border. Indeed the damsels in Heaven hope for victory when there are the demons invading as enemies, on the bow of this king with the string tied on it, and also on the thunderbolt of the king of the Heaven."[40] It is only the second position that is given to the King of the Heaven and the first place is given to the king on earth. At a later stage in the development of the plot in the drama, when the king was in the palace garden full of remorse at having had to abandon the heroine through some misfortune, a message arrived from the King of Heaven asking the hero to go to Heaven for help against the demons who had invaded the heavenly region, through Matali, the charioteer of the King of the Heaven.

Matali: The King of the Heaven has declared the demons as the proper target for your arrows. Bend your bow only in respect of them. The eyes of good people fall on good people with a look of softness through being pleased, and not the fierce arrows.[41]

King: O it is Matali; welcome to the charioteer of the great King of the Heaven.

Matali: (with a smile) Long life to you. Please hear why it is that I have been sent to you by the King of the Heaven.

King: I am attentive.

Matali; There is a group of demons by name Durjaya, being the progeny of Kalanemi.

King: It is so; I have heard so from Narada.

Matali; They are not possible to be defeated by the King of the Heaven, your friend; it is heard that you are able to kill them in a battle. Therefore, may Your Majesty be pleased to ascend this chariot of the King of the Heaven now, wearing the weapons and set out for victory over them.[42]

Against Raghu, the King of the Heavens was presented as one who ought to have been sporting in the harem with women instead of fighting against such a great hero. Here is again the same King of the Heaven who approaches the king on earth for help against his enemies since he is not able to fight against such enemies himself. People from Heaven come to the earth and enjoy life here. If they returned to Heaven after a short stay it is not due to any unwillingness to further stay on here. They never felt unhappy on earth during their stay. For some other reasons they had to go back, if they went back. Indumati is the only heroine described in the first eight Cantos of the *Raghuvaṁśa*, and she was originally a celestial damsel who had to come to the earth and live here for some time as the result of some curse by a sage[43]. The queen of Dilipa is only introduced as an accident and she is not the centre of any sort of description in the epic. There is just a mention of the wedding of Raghu,[44] and nothing is said about the queen except that a son was born.[45] It is in the case of the third king that we come across a heroine also. And that heroine is a celestial damsel destined to come to the earth and spend a happy life here. Both in the *Śākuntala* and in the *Raghuvaṁśa*, there is a mingling of Heaven with earth, and to the extent that is possible in such incidental references to the two, the earth is described as superior to the Heaven.

The real philosophy of life pertaining to the relation of Heaven and earth is found in the *Vikramorvaśīya*, and unless the drama is interpreted with such a philosophy, the drama has little value also. In the *Raghuvaṁśa* and in the *Śākuntala*, the heroine had only some sort of connection with Heaven, but was not really a resident of Heaven at the time of the incidents of the poems. Indumati, the heroine in the story of the third king in the *Raghuvaṁśa* was only a damsel of Heaven in a former stage and not a resident of Heaven at the time of the incidents in the epic, namely, her marriage and her life with the hero. Similarly, the heroine in the *Śākuntala* was the daughter of a heavenly damsel, but was in herself a human being brought up in the forest hermitage by a sage.

In the *Vikramorvaśīya*, the hero is a king on earth and the heroine is a Heavenly damsel. When she lived with the hero on earth, she was still a Heavenly damsel. She came down from Heaven in her Heavenly body with her Heavenly companion, and lived in that body with the hero afterwards for a very long time. There was no change in her body or form.[46] It is a real union between a hero on earth and a heroine in Heaven. The heroine with her companions was going through the celestial regions and they fell into the hands of some strong demon. The hero was passing that way and hearing their wailings, he went to them and released them from captivity. That is how the hero and the heroine met for the first time. They fell in love with each other. In so far as the love was mutual, it may be said that there is a mingling of Heaven and earth as equal elements.[47] The king talked about the Heavenly companion to his confidentialcompanion, the *Vidūṣaka*. In the case of the heroine, she decided to come down to the earth to try her chance of winning the love of the hero.[48] In spite of the earthly hero's intense longing to meet the Heroine, he did not think of going to Heaven and meet her, though he could easily go there; he was constantly going to Heaven for meeting the king of that region in a very free way. This shows the distinction between the earthly being and the Heavenly being, in point of steadines and ability to control the feelings.

The Heavenly heroine met the hero in his own palace. She came down to the earth with her companion and both of them were listening to the conversation of the hero with his confidential companion, and then the heroine asks her companion to go to the hero and announce themselves to him. Both of them had supernatural powers on account of their celestial origin, and they were able to cover themselves from the sight of others. First the companion of the heroine goes to the hero and presents herself and the following conversation makes clear the difference between the earthly hero and the celestial heroine.

Companion : Urvasi bows to the emperor with her head and passes on this information.

Hero : What is her command?

Companion : When I had the danger from the enemies of the gods Your Majety alone became the protection. The same myself, being greatly overcome by the pangs of love arising out of seeing ycu, is now to be the object of pity for Your Majesty.

Hero : O announcer of auspicious news,
You talk of her, whose sight is much coveted by me, as in a state of affliction; you do not notice Pururavas suffering on her account. This love and affection is common to both.

It is a hot iron that is fit to be joined to another heated iron.[49]

Companion (Approaching the heroine): Come my dear. Finding the lord of love far more cruel to him than in your case, I have become the messenger from your lover.

Heroine (removing the supernatural cover): Oh, you have now simply abandoned me.

Companion: Even a moment after now, we will know who has abandoned and whom.

Heroine (With bashfullness): Victory, victory to Your Majesty.

Hero: O fascinating lady (takes her with her hands and places her on the seat)

(In the green - room)

A Messenger of Gods: Chitralekha, hurry up Urvasi.

That performance based on the eight *Rasas*,[50] which had been taught you by the sage Bharata, now the king of the gods, along with the lords of the Quarters, is eager to witness, as exhibited in a beautiful way.[51]

(The Heroine shows signs of grief)

Companion: Your Majesty has heard what the messenger of the gods has said to my beloved friend. May Your Majesty give her permission to go.

Heroine: I have no voice.

Companion: Your Majesty, this person is dependent on others Therefore, with the permission of Your Majesty she desires to free herself from any wrong being done to the gods.

(The Heroine, with signs of grief at separation, departs with the companion.)[52]

The Heroine went back to the Heaven and there, she took part in the performance of a drama, which Bharata had taught them all to stage.

During the performance, instead of saying the word *Puruṣottama* (the Ideal among men) she actually uttered the word *Purūravas*, since her mind was full of thoughts about Pururavas, the Hero. She had taken the part of one of the characters, named Lakshmi and her fried Menaka, another celestial nymph, had taken the part of Varuni; the latter asked her: "Friend, here are assembled these lords of the quarters, the greatest persons in the whole of the three worlds, along with Kesava. In whom among them are your thoughts fixed?" It is in this context that Urvasi, the heroine, instead of saying "in *Puruṣottama*", actually said "in *Purūravas*". Then the teacher, the sage Bharata, cursed her: "Since you have made such a mistake in what I have taught you, you will lose your position in Heaven." Then, at the end of the performance, the king of the Heaven told her when she was standing in front of him with her face drooped down through bashfulness: "We have to comply with the desires of him who is the object of your desires since he is my help in my wars, the saintly king. So you are free to go and stay with Pururavas, till he will be able to see a baby through you."[53]

Urvasi, the celestial nymph became the wife of the earthly king and they lived in happiness for a long time in a garden on the mountains far away from the city. Then by an accident, the heroine had to leave the hero all on a sudden. Urvasi left the king and the latter was full of remorse at this unexpected separation. At this stage, three Acts of the drama are finished, and the fourth Act is a monologue, where only the king appears on the scene. In grief the king wanders about in the garden and then he asks the trees and the creepers and the birds and the animals and the various objects of Nature like the cloud and the moon, whether any of them had seen the beloved who had departed from him so suddenly. From the point of view of the strict rules of plot construction, such a long scene with only one character and with practically no movement of the story, seems quite inappropriate.

Here we must understand that there is nothing that can be called a plot in this drama and that there is no characterisation either. There is no character that evinces an individuality. They have no originality and no life. We find them all floating in the air, with little of movement and with no action. What we find in this drama is a tableau, with plenty of music and dance. The whole drama presents to us a large picture with earth and Heaven coming in alternatively or together and with the people of Heaven and earth mingled together. The earthly hero and the celestial heroine meet and they fall in love, and with little of obstacle they come together also as husband and wife. In the *Śākuntala* we see the hero and the heroine together; but it is the difficulty of their coming together that sustains the interest. Here we find little of obstacle of that form in the way of the hero and the heroine coming together. Providence come to their help, and in the third Act, we find that they are united to each other as husband and wife. In the *Śākuntala* also, we find that the marriage between the hero and the heroine takes place by the end of the third Act, and while only two more Acts remain in the *Vikramorvaśīya*, there are four more, more than half of the text, still remaining after the marriage in the *Śākuntala*. But there is a great difference between the two dramas. In the *Śākuntala*, it is after the marriage, when they are separated again, that we find the plot developing with greater momentum, that the hero and the heroine both acquire some sort of individuality and independence. Further, in the *Śākunlala*, the separation of the hero and the heroine was not the result of any fault of theirs, and this fact I will take up in the next lecture. It is a mere accident that brought about such a seperation, which enabled the story to continue in a natural way, after the marriage of the hero and the heroine.

In the *Vikramorvaśīya*, the hero may not be to blame for the cause of their separation after his union with the heroine and their decision to live together. But the hero had made a bad choice and the suffering later is due to that mistake in his choice. It is this mistake in a choice that is the central point in the drama; and the fourth Act, with its monologue, can be understood only if we recognise this mistake in the choice made by the hero. The hero had a queen already; in the *Śākuntala* there is no other character introduced in the actual development of the plot by way of a rival of the heroine, to bring about the obstacle to the union of the hero and the horoine; there were queens in the court of the king even in the *Śākuntala* and they are kept behind, though hinted at in the course of the story.[54]

This first queen of the hero is a noble lady, all devoted to the welfare of the hero, very faithful to him, calm and dignified, suffering grief and even humiliation with composure, sacrificing her personal interests for the happiness of the hero. And that companion of the hero is an earthly lady. It is in this context that a celestial heroine is introduced, impelled by personal motives, stirred by carnal desires, with no consideration for the queen who was already a companion to the hero whom the heroine loves. She had her carnal pleasures satisfied for some time and she had no permanent love for or interest in the hero. This fickle celestial heroine is brought into the story as a contrast to the constancy and faithfullness of the earthly queen.

The hero thought, through some mental aberration, that he could find great happiness in the company of a celestial damsel, and he knew what the result was. It is at this stage that he wanders about in the garden, seeking the aid of the objects of Nature on earth for discovering the object of his love, which he considered as the source of great happiness in life. The mistake of the hero was that he considered the happiness arising out of association with a celestial companion as superior to the happiness from his association with an earthly companion. In this union of an earthly hero and a celestial heroine, the passion developed in the celestial heroine was much stronger than in the case of the earthly hero, and it is she who comes down to the earth to win the love of the earthly hero. The latter becomes a victim to the charms of the celestial heroine, and though he derives some sort of temporary joy in the company of the celestial heroine, she proves to be very fickle; and the hero suffers for neglecting his earthly companion to win the love of the celestial companion. In the end he finds that it is only in the objects of Nature on earth that he could hope to find any aid for regaining his lost happiness.

KALIDASA handles the theme in such a way that the hero finds that same source of joy concealed in the objects of Nature on earth, and when the hero was making a search for his lost beloved, he found a gem and after taking that gem he was able to find a creeper which turned out to be the heroine herself. The heroine confesses her guilt in being angry with the hero for such a small default and they both decided to go to the city where the people must be wondering what the king might be doing for such a long time.[55] The following actual passage from the drama is full of significance. The context is that the king was searching for the heroine in the garden and he sees something unusual in the stones.

The Hero: What is this that is seen within the stone which is cloven?

This cannot be a piece of flesh from the body of an antilope killed by a lion, since this is shrouded in lustre. Can it be a burning cinder? But the sky has just rained,

(looking at closely)

Hallo, this is a gem red like the bud of a red *Aśoka;* it looks as though the Sun is stretching his rays (or hands) to pick it up.[76]

This attracts my attention. Now, I will take it up, Or, This gem is worthy of being placed on the hair of that lady, which is made fragrant with the flowers of *Mandāra;*

that beloved of mine is now not easy to get back. Why should I spoil it by smearing it with my tears?[57]

(In the green room)

Boy, take it, take it.

This is a gem named *Saṅgamanīya* (conducive to union), originated from the red lac, which the Daughter of the Mountain[58] had applied to her feet. Any one who wears it will without much delay, secure union with the object of his love.[59]

Hero (listening): Who could it be who is giving me this instruction? (Looking all around) Really, some venerable sage moving about in the celestial regions takes pity on me. O venerable sage, I am blessed by you through this instruction (Picking up the gem) O *Saṅgāmanīya*: If you will be a help for me to get united with her who is endowed with a circular waist, when I am in separation, then I will make you a crest-jewel for myself.[60] (Going round and looking)। What is it? When I see this creeper without flowers, I feel some love roused in me. Or, it may be that it is attractive for me. Now, I will embrace this creeper that looks like an imitation of my beloved. (He embraces the creeper and keeps his eyes closed. Then in that place, as a substitute of that creeper, Urvasi appears)

Hero: I feel that my body has become gratified through the contact of the body of Urvasi. Still I have no confidence. (Slowly he opens his eyes) How is it? Truly this is my most beloved.

Heroine: Victory, victory to Your Majesty. I was able to see all your movements, since I had all my senses within me.

Hero: Why do you say, "I had all my senses *within* me"? I do not understand the meaning of this statement.

Heroine: I will tell you what it is. Your Majesty may pardon me that you have been brought into this condition by me, having surrendered myself to anger. May Your Majesty hear. The Lord Kumara, having taken up a vow of eternal life of celebacy took his abode in a field on the mountain

Gandhamadana, named Akalusha, and made this condition that whichever woman comes into this place, will be converted into the form of a creeper, and she will not be released from that state without the gem originated from the foot of Gauri.[61] On account of my mind having been clouded as a result of the curse of our teacher, I forgot this condition of the god and entered this Garden of Kumara. As soon as I entered, I became a *Vāsantī* creeper.

Hero: Everything becomes clear now. This is the gem which I got from a Sage and through the greatness of this gem, I was able to gain you.

(He shows the gem)

Heroine: O *Saṅgamanīya*. Indeed it is through this that as soon as I was embraced by His Majesty, I was able to regain my nature. Now it is a long time since you have left the city of Pratishthana.[62] The people will be annoyed with me; let us go there.[63]

Here is the re-union of heaven with earth after a short period of separation. During this separation, the earthly hero had some mental grief and he wandered about in the gardens and in the woods in search of the heroine. On the other side, the heroine had to spend her time as an inanimate being, and it was the hero himself who could restore her to her real nature. The means for this restoration of the real nature of the celestial heroine was secured not from her own heavenly supernatural powers, but from the earthly Nature itself, from some gem which the earthly hero had contacted by chance. In the end the heroine expressed her sense of guilt for the whole unfortunate situation.

From the very beginning of the drama, when the heroine found herself rescued from the clutches of the demon by the hero we find the superiority of earth and of men on earth over Heaven and gods in Heaven as the prominent theme in the drama. At that time, when it was announced to the heroine that they had been rescued, she asks her friends who it was that saved them, and whether it was the great King of the Heaven, and they reply that it was by a saintly king with grandeur equalling to that of the celestial king. Then, she looks at him and says that the demons had done her a great favour, meaning that it is a favour to have been able to be associated with the king, even though there was the captivity attached to that occasion;[64] The king of the heaven confessed that he could not do anything that might offend the great king on the earth and so he asked the heroine to go to the earth and to remain with him, till he would see a son.[65]

It was on account of this condition for her stay in the earthly region that the heroine had concealed the son born at that time from the sight of the hero. She said to the king at the time of the appearance of the son who was identified as such through some accident: "May your Majesty listen. At first by the sight of the son I fotgot something. Now when the name of Indra is mentioned, some condition comes to my mind." The hero asks her what that condition was and she replies: "Formerly, since my heart was in the grip of Your Majesty, I was ordered by Indra — when this saintly king, my dear friend, will see the face of a son born of you who will continue the dynasty, you have to come back to me again. Therefore being afraid of separation from Your Majesty, I placed him in the hands of the venerable Satyavati for the purpose of being educated in the hermitage of Chyavana, as soon as he was born. Now she has brought him back to you since he has become competent to be of service to the father. Therefore this much is my life with Your Majesty," At this stage, the great sage Narada came there with a message from Indra about the possibility of a war between the gods and the demons and the necessity of the hero continuing his activity on earth with his weapons in his hands for helping the gods in that war. The heroine had also instruction to continue her life on earth as the wife of the hero as long as the hero was alive.[66]

This drama is a continuous song on the glory of the earth and on the people on earth and on the life on earth as far superior to Heaven and the people of Heaven and life in Heaven. This doctrine of the superiority of the earth over heaven has been hinted and even mentioned in many other places in the other works of KALIDASA; but this work is completely devoted to this theme. Celestial happiness is fickle and not lasting. It is only when the same happiness has been attained after a vigourous search in the objects of Nature on earth, and on this earth, that it becomes of lasting value. This is the importance of the fourth Act which is a monologue without a story and without a movement. It has no position in a plot of the drama by itself. The heroine got from the heaven, gave the hero only a temporary happiness, and she was subject to petty anger; and through such an anger she left him. But when the king made a search in the objects of Nature on earth, he got the same happines, and that of a permanent nature, without any of the defects of the happiness got from Heaven.

The drama is an allegory on the relative values of earth and Heaven. Earth is always superior to Heaven, and Heaven has a value only if it is a continuation of the life on earth; Heaven has no value, eitheir, as an escape from earth or as a substitute for the earth.

RENUNCIATION AND RELEASE

In the ninteenth century there has been a great change in the life of man. Faith in, and subordination to, the message of a Teacher and the interpretations and expansions and enforcements of that message by a Church, began to give way to rationalism, to a spirit of questioning, to doubt and to free thinking. People who had to live within the limits of the control of the church found new homes in far off countries, free from such domination by a Church. Science developed, and that gave a new presentation of the relation between man and the world in which man lives. The world, instead of being created by a God, was thought of as an evolution from within itself and by itself; man, instead of being a creation of God and subordinate to a God, become in the minds of the scientists, a free being, a product of the natural evolution, subordinate only to the law of Nature. A thing called a Spirit, as distinct from Matter, was practically dispensed with in science, and life became a form of material activity.

There was a re-action to this new development. There grew up a fear that in the absence of a spirit, all ethical values also may disappear from the life of man. Many new movements were started in which religion was retained as a potent factor in the affairs of man, which could be reconciled to the doctrines of the newly developed science. It was during this stage in the development of the new outlook on the relation of man to the world that the literatures of the East became known to the west. Sanskrit which contained the records of the religion of India, known as Hinduism, and Pali which contained the literature relating to Buddhism, became very popular in the West. Buddhism did not accept a God as the creater and as the controller of the world, and the Church attached to this religion was only an organisation to uphold the law of Nature and the law of moral life as set in motion by Buddha. Rituals formed a very unimportant element in this religion; rationalism, free thinking, was a cardinal factor in it. There was the order of *Bhikkus,* the monks who had renounced all their desires in, and their attachment to, the needs of life, and they all lived a life of service to man and were devoted to pure life. There was no caste or class distinction in this religion. The moral element dominated its main doctrines. For these reasons, it was Buddhism that attracted the attention of the students of the new religious literature which came to the West from the East, who were devoted to establish a religion that fulfilled the needs of spiritual and moral life while satisfying the needs of the modern science with its freedom of thought. The religion of India known as Hinduism, did not make an appeal to the modern students of religion to the same extent. It was felt that Hinduism had too much of ritualism, was too much authoritarian in so far as it accepted the supreme authority of the Vedas, recognised caste distinction and contained a large number of practices of a religious nature which went against the needs of moral life.

It was in such an atmosphere that some attempt was made to read into the works of KALIDASA some elements of a philosophy of life. The ancient commentators in India never worried about the problem of the philosophy of life in the works of KALIDASA; they were satisfied with the applications of the canons of literary criticism, the test with the formal rules for the construction of a drama or an epic, and they all tried to prove that all the rules of literary criticism like the nature of the hero and the heroine and the other characters, and the nature of the construction of the plot, could be strictly applied to the works of KALIDASA, and that from the point of view of formal literary criticism, the works were perfect. When the works of KALIDASA become known to the literary men of the West, they all admired the drama *Śākuntala* as is evidenced by the eulogy written on it by the great German poet Goethe. The *Śākuntala* continued to enjoy its position as a great drama in the estimation of the west. But nothing like an examination of the philosophy of life in the works of KALIDASA was attempted by the modern students of literature either in India or in the West. So far as I know it was Tagore who started writing some articles on this subject. He has given a good picture of his own views on the point in his Introduction to the English translation of a stage version of the *Śākuntala* by Lawrence Binyon.

A fear of materialism as a danger to moral life in the world, a suspecion about matter as an impediment to the attainment of the highst goal of man, a preference to the perfect happiness in a state after and beyond the span of life on earth, a desire to escape from entanglements in the affairs of the world like marriage and family life, a consequent aversion for women as 'seats and causes of suffering and the assignment of a high value to renunciation, which are all aspects of the Buddhistic view of life in essence, found very prominent notice in the interpretation of the philosophy of life in the works of KALIDASA, especially in the *Śākuntala*, undertaken in modern times, and the lead was given by Tagore in this direction.

Sakuntala was leading a pure and a simple life, and as such a beautiful life, in the forest hermitage of her foster-father, when the king came there and entangled her in thoughts about and experiences in the carnal elements in the life of man on earth, for the first time. The king and Sakuntala fell in love with each other and there was an overload of the carnal side in their mutual attachment. This in its turn brought about the consequence in the form of a curse by a sage named Durvasas which led to their separation. Sakuntala, being under the influence of the carnal side of her love for the king, neglected her duty to a guest and that was the cause for the curse by the sage, who came there as a guest. After this enforced separation, the king was full of remorse and Sakuntala had to live in another hermitage in repentence; this brought about spiritual purity in both of them, and the result was that they were re-united and they enjoyed lasting happiness. Desire for material enjoyment is the enemy of happiness, while penance, detachment from material considerations, brings about lasting happiness. This in essence is the philosophy of life read into the *Śākuntala*. The same doctrine is read into the epic, the *Kumārasāmbhava* also. Parvati's love for Siva was a physical one; so, that love brought about only destruction to Love itself in the person of the Lord of Love (Kamadeva) who was burnt to death by the fire from the eyes of the God, Siva, who was full of wrath on account of the attempt to direct physical love towards him. Then Parvati undertook severe penance, and the great God was pleased and the God agreed to accept her as his consort. Here is a philosophy of life in the form of a contrast between physical love which brings about destruction and suffering, and spiritual love free from material considerations, which alone brings about lasting happiness.

So far as I know, this is the only attempt made by any one to read a consistent philosophy of life into the works of KALIDASA; later on other people also have tried to traverse the same path. But this is only one side of the philosophy of life that can be read into the works of KALIDASA, and this philosophyis influenced by the opposition to material science and an eagerness to restore the notions of religion with its other-worldliness and its detachment from the world. We do not know what KALIDASA himself had thought of a philosophy of life. He says very little about it.

KALIDASA must always be studied with the background of the culture of the *Mahābhārata* and the *Rāmāyaṇa*, and also the culture of Buddhism. Buddha according to their tradition, was a prince, heir to the throne; but he left off his wife and his royal family and his throne and took to renunciation, and through his spiritual powers he conquered the world. In the *Mahābhārata* we find another tradition. Yudhishthira, the king, was deprived of his kingdom by his cousin through treachery and he had to go into exile, quite against his will, along with his queen and his brothers; and he spent thirteen years partly in the forest and partly incognito in a city. During their life in the forest, the brothers fought against various enemies and destroyed them all through their physical might, and afterwards they fought against their cousin, and killing him and his brothers, they won back the kingdom and they all lived in happiness. Draupadi became the wife of the hero of the epic on account of the physical valour exhibited at the time of the wedding of the princess. Sri Krishna and all the great sages councelled them to work for winning back the kingdom, and they helped them also in that effort. Similarly, in the *Rāmāyaṇa*, Shri Rama who was the heir to the throne, was deprived of the throne; he had already won the hands of the heroine through his phyisical might. He went to the forest as a necessity and not as a free choice, with his queen and his brother. There he lost his consort, and he chased the demon who had abducted her through a treachery, killed him and regained his consort. Then he came back to the kingdom and ruled the country. During the period of exile, he had secured the friendship of a mighty king who helped him in his final victory, and the sages in the forest also councelled him to acquire physical power, to use it against the enemies and to work for ultimate victory. They also helped him in this direction by bestowing various weapons on him.

It is true that attempts have been made to read into epics of this structure an element of forbearance and non-attachment as a vital part of the philosophy of life taught in them. Earlier literary critics recognised only eight aspects of the general spirit pervading a literary work, like love, heroism and remorse. But a new spirit in the form of calmness, serenity (*Śānta*) was added by later literary critics. There can be little doubt that the spirit of Buddhism had some influence in the development of this side of literary criticism. But this spirit has been recognised later as the chief one pervading the two grand epics of Sanskrit literature. But no one can deny the element of the glorification of physical power and the enjoyment of life, found taught in both of them.

Similarly, renunciation and non-attachment to the physical pleasures do not exhaust the philosophy of life found in the works of KALIDASA. There are other sides also. In deciding the relative importance and the final philosophy contained in the works of KALIDASA, one cannot avoid much of a personal equation also on the part of the student of the works. But the facts can be presented as culled from the works, without any personal factor coming into the picture. They are all in the works and they do not depend on any interpretation.

The epic named the *Raghuvaṁśa* starts with an enumeration of the great qualities of the kings belonging to the dynasty which the poet proposed to describe in the epic. There are sixteen such qualities enumerated, and they are: pure from the birth, working till the fruits appear; lords of the earth up to the ocean, driving their chariots up to the heavens, making offerings in Fire according to prescriptions, satisfying the applicants according to their needs, punishing the culprits according to their guilt, waking up at the right time, amassing wealth for distribution, speaking little to ensure truth, desiring victory for fame, marrying to secure a son, educated in childhood, enjoying life in youth, leading the life of a recluse at old age and throwing off the body through Yogic powers at the end.[1]

Only two of them, namely, making offerings in Fire and throwing off the body at the end of their life have any relation to things beyond this world. All the other good qualities mentioned here relate to life on earth. This preliminary statement about the theme of the epic he was writing, shows that in writing the epic, the peot was interested in the affairs of the world and that he had little interest in what would happen to a man after his death, in another world. Certainly this is not the way in which KALIDASA would have started the epic, if he had any partiality towards the problems of release from the sufferings in life on earth. The last item in the above enumeration, relating to throwing off the body at the end of the life, has to be examined in relation to the entire context of the epic.

Nearly all the virtues enumerated are also illustrated by some incident or other in the story of Raghu. And this particular point, namely, casting off the body, comes in mainly in the context of Raghu. At the end of the narration of the exploits of Raghu, after his march of victory, after the wedding of his son and after the installation of the son on the throne, it is said that Raghu retired to a garden nearby for penance. Then he cast off his body also in due course. This context requires close study.

"Then, when Raghu saw his son well established among the people, free from any mental deflections, he became disinterested in the affairs of life even in the heavenly regions, in so far as they are of the nature of being destructible. The son of Dilipa,[2] bestowing his royal splendour on the son endowed with all the necessary virtues, at the end his life, bringing his mind under control, took to the path of those with mental discipline, who wear robes of the barks of trees."[3] There is no doubt on the point that here KALIDASA definitely says that the happiness on earth, and also in heaven, is not permanent, and as such not a fit object for being coveted. There must be some other happiness, something that is transcendental, which man should look for at a certain stage in his life. And that stage is towards the end of the life. Man is born on earth with a purpose, and when that purpose is served, man should look for another place where he can attain some transcendental joy. This must be behind the thoughts of KALIDASA when he wrote this verse. At the end, it is said: "Then spending some years out of interest in Aja, looking on everything with equanimity, he reached the *Puruṣa* (Self) that is beyond of darkness, the supreme, through the practice of Yoga."[4] Here there is the indication of the attainment of some transcendental stage by Raghu through Yoga at the end of his busy life on earth.

There is another place where KALIDASA is explicit on what the ultimate end of life should be. That is at the end of his drama, *Śākuntala*, in the benedictory verse that closes the drama. The verse is: "May the king work for the good of the people; may culture, which is superior to scripture, remain supreme (in the life of the people). And in my own case, may the Dark-Red Deity, the self-born, surrounded with Power, put an end to my re-birth." Here there are two prayers. One is for the people and the other is for himself. For the people, what is prayed for is that the king may rule them properly working for their prosperity and that there be culture among them as the dominant factor in their life. For himself, there is the prayer for the end of this series of birth and death.

There is something that is introduced here as what the people shall have; there is something else that is introduced as what is good for particular individuals. What happened to Raghu, as described in the *Raghuvaṁśa*, cannot be dissociated from this prayer of what is good for an individual, in the *Śākuntala*. What has been mentioned as the end of Raghu is what KALIDASA thinks of as for the few, the individuals who form an exception to the generality of the people; this is not an end for all. If that be the end for all, such an end has no more practical value than what the problem of the end of the world has for man in his life-affairs. A star may disappear; but the starry sky continues. The absence of a star is known only by specialists in astronomy and is not noticed by the people who look up to the sky night after night.

Further, this end of Raghu is not an escape from the sufferings on earth; it is at best an expansion of what is circumscribed and not a migration from one state to another. What is impermanent is not a cause of suffering. It is the door to what is permanent. There may be a dissatisfaction in the experience of what is not permanent; but that dissatisfaction can be the basis of a hope of the attainment of what is permanent, what will bring about full satisfaction. *Mokṣa* or release presupposes a sense of bondage; but in the description of the various events in the course of Raghu's life, there is no sort of indication that life is a bondage. KALIDASA does not use the term *Mokṣa* at all in designating the final goal of human activities. What he says is not a *release* from any bondage; it is only an expansion of what is circumscribed, an illumination of what is dim, a fulfilment of what is implied, a permanence of what appears as transitory. This is what is found in the famous passage of the *Bṛhadārṇyakopaniṣad*: Lead me from non-being to being; lead me from death to permanency; lead me from darkness to light.[5] The actual words used by KALIDASA in the context of the end of Raghu's life are similar to what we find in the *Bhagavad Gītā*: "With the lustre of the sun, beyond darkness, he reaches that *Puruṣa*, supreme and celestial."[6]

KALIDASA speaks of a trenscendental goal; but it cannot be called *Mokṣa* or release in so far as there is no indication that there was any prior bondage. It can be called an attainment. This attainment is what is for the very few, which has no practical significance as a goal in man's life on earth. This attainment of the supreme *Puruṣa* is indicated in the *Ṛgveda* where the place of Vishnu is spoken of as "That highest abode of Vishnu, the poets always see."[7] In later mythology, the abode of Vishnu is called the *Vaikuṇṭha*, and the form of *Mokṣa*, the attainment of the final goal, is to reach that place, to assume the form of Vishnu and to be near him. Such notions of transcendental attainment are quite different from the notion of *Mokṣa* as a "goal kept in view in human activities (*Puruṣarṭha*)," and it has nothing to do with a supreme goal, (the *Paramapuruṣārtha*). Just as there is a continuation of the happiness enjoyed in life on earth when one reaches the heaven after a full life here, there is a possibility of a further expansion, which is destined for the few. This is the view of KALIDASA, and this is quite a different thing. *Mokṣa*, even heaven, is not a goal sought after through man's activities. It is what naturally follows a full life. What I want to lay emphasis on is that KALIDASA does not recognise a fourfold system of values; he recognises only three values and all the three have reference to life on earth. They are *Dharma*, *Artha* and *Kāma*.[8] That is what he has illustrated by the description of the three kings, Dilipa, Raghu and Aja in the *Raghuvaṁśa*.

In the Vedic thought, there are only the three values of *Dharma*, *Artha* and *Kāma*. There is **Svarga** (Heaven); ubt nothing is found regarding a *Mokṣa* or final release. This element came in at a later time, from some external source. Then it was assimilated to the Vedic system of thought. Just as in the Vedic scheme, heaven comes in as a natural effect of a full life on earth, *Mokṣa* too was accepted as something which naturally comes in as a result of good life. It was called an *Artha* or goal, only as a language necessity, and not on account of its real nature.[9] It is what comes, not what is brought; so it is not a purpose, not a goal

This *Mokṣa* is, according to the religion of KALIDASA, of the form of an illumination, the realisation of that Supreme Self, that is beyond darkness. For such an illumination of the mind, for becoming an "Awakened", there is no need to give up the world. Raghu led the most active life possible, and even at the close of his life, when he installed his son on the throne, he kept on near the palace so that when any occasion might arise, he would be available for action; it is only when he was satisfied that there would be no further need for any action on his part that he actually left off his body and saw the "Light" in the form of the Supreme *Puruṣa* (Self). Dilipa went to the forest where Hermits perform penance[10] and Raghu took to the robes of tree-barks when he gave the throne to his son, only as a matter of environmental convention, and not as a matter of necessity for the attainment of the final goal. They followed the conventions current among the hermits.

The idea that enjoyments in this world are of a transient nature is tracable to the Vedas, especially to the *Upaniṣads*. The fruits of action in this world are transient and it is only the fruits of knowledge that are of a permanent nature; this doctrine is expressly stated in the *Upaniṣads*[11] and is implied in the *Ṛgveda* itself. The realisation of the supreme *Puruṣa* (Self), the impermanent nature of the fruits of activities in this world and the permanency of the fruits of knowledge are not against the Vedic tradition about world and life and freedom. What is against the Vedic religion, which is found in the later religious growths in India, is the doctrine of the life on earth being of the nature of suffering, the world being sin and a bondage and the attainment of release from this bondage being the only true goal of man, which man should strive for. To the Vedic thought, imperfection is not bondage; what is associated with the ordinary life is only imperfection and not bondage. This is the distinction between KALIDASA's doctrine of the final stage in a man's life and the doctrine of *Mokṣa* according to the latter-day religion of the country. KALIDASA presents the Vedic doctrine correctly, while the latter-day doctrines are mixed up with foreign doctrines.

Closely associated with the problem of *Mokṣa* is the problem of the nature of life and of the embodiment of the self. KALIDASA has something to say on this point also in his *Raghuvaṁśa*. When Aja lost his beloved Indumati and he was immersed in grief, his family teacher Vasishtha sent him a message of solace, and towards the close of this message there are the words: "It is said by the wise people that for men, death is the nature and life is an accident. If a being lives even for a moment with breath, is not that a great gain? It is a man of dull intellect that considers the death of a beloved as a deadly weapen thrown on him; but a man of steady mind considers that itself as having been plucked out in so far as that is the door leading towards happiness. When it is known from the Veda that one's body and self are united to, and separated from, each other, why should separation from external objects create remorse in a man of wisdom? Tell me."[12]

Here one finds much of what is contained in the second chapter of the *Gītā*, where the real nature of the Self is given as what cannot be destroyed and where the relation of the Self with body is also stated to be fickle. Thus death is not a cause for any kind of grief in a thinking man. Dissociation with the momentary body is spoken of above as the door to happiness; it is so in so far as the hero could be united to the heroine on a permanent basis only when both of them cast off their mortal bodies; and as such the loss of the mortal body by the heroine, being the way to their meeting again in heaven at a later stage, must be a cause of joy for the hero. The commentators say that the cause of joy is that it would lead to *Mokṣa*. But we have to read this passage along with what takes place later. Towards the end of the Canto, it is said that the hero felt the body to be the seat of ailments that cannot be cured by physicians[13] and that it is only when this body is thrown off and a new body in heaven is secured that there can be permanent happiness with his beloved, and he got it in heaven when he died and when he was freed from his body,[14]

In the light of this later development, the meaning of the few verses that appear to be a condemnation of the existence of man in a body and the recommendation of the freedom from body must be taken as a promise to the hero from the family teacher that in *his* case, it is a blessing and that the separation from the beloved would ultimately lead to a higher form of happiness for him. This is a step in the transformation of the situation of grief into a situation of supreme happiness which KALIDASA has worked out in this centext. There is no statement here that indicates a philosophy of pessimism, that life is only suffering and that real happiness is only after death, in freedom from body and life on earth. That the real nature of the Self is a state of disembodiment and that embodiment is an accident are aspects of thought current in those days; so far as the hero in this context is concerned, it became really true also. I see nothing here that can be interpreted as a condemnation of life on earth. Neither in the case of Raghu who lived an active life, and continued in readiness for activity even after retirement, nor in the case of Aja who lost his beloved and who later was reunited with her after his own death, in heaven, is there a philosophy of pessimism taught by KALIDASA for all. In the former case, it is an attainment for an individual and not a teaching for all; in the case of the latter, it has relation to a special situation of a celestial damsel who was the heroine, having gone back to her celestial abode, leaving the hero behind with only one choice of reunion with her, namely, to throw off his earthly body and attain a celestial body. Generally, KALIDASA glorifies life on earth as superior to life in heaven.

The philosophy of Life and Renunciation and *Mokṣa* is fully developed by KALIDASA in his *Śākuntala* and it is in the context of this drama that in modern times also there has been an interpretation of the philosophy of KALIDASA as one favouring retirement from the activities and enjoyments of the physical world. I have already indicated the general line of this thought earlier in this lecture. I give some citations below to show the spirit of the interpretation of the philosophy of life found in this new approeach:

"So too, amidst KALIDASA's outbursts of beauty, a sense of averson to pleasure lurks hidden. He is at once the poet of the enjoyment of beauty and of abstinence of enjoyment...........His poetry does not end in aesthetic delight; he stops only after transcending such delight..................[15]

In both of them, the union which Cupid tried to effect was accursed of the gods; it failed, and in its failure it perished amidst all its gorgeous artistic environment like a youth struck dead on his floral bridal coach. Thereafter came another union effected by bitter sorrow and severe penance; a union of quite a different character, stripped of all the external robes of beauty and encircled with the halo of goodness..............

In all ages and in all countries the discarded woman has been forced to realise that physical charms are vain and to creep homewards with a heart left lonely of its good. Physical charm is not the highest glory or supreme beauty in a woman".[16]

Tagore has written many articles relating to his own interpretation of KALIDASA's philosophy of life. The above citations are from one of them about the *Kumārasambhava* and the *Śākuntala*. The above is a specimen that shows the direction in which his thoughts proceed. Many of them like "The Message of the Forest" and "Creative Unity" are included in the collected editions of his works by Macmillan.

In a lyric it is very easy to know what the poet thought of a particular point; the reader is in direct communion with the heart of the poet, and the poet addresses straight to the reader of the poem. There is no intermediary between the poet and the reader. In an epic also, there is a direct relation between the author and the reader, in so far as the poet addresses the reader directly, though sometimes the story and the characters appearing in the epic stand between the author and the reader; the reader often finds himself in personal relation to the development of the plot and the characters appearing in the story. But it is not at all difficult to know what the author could have thought of a particular point from what is dealt with in the epic.

In a drama, it is quite different. The dramatist is nowhere; the audience is face to face with only the plot and the characters in the story. What we find is the view of that character in that situation, and not the view of the dramatist. But even here, it is not impossible to know what the dramatist could have thought of any particular point that is introduced in the drama, apart from the view of the character that expresses the idea. In a drama there are many characters and the characters can be grouped separately with some contrast and even conflict between the groups. The hero and the characters around him form one group and the counter-hero or the villain and the characters around him represent another group. The sympathy of the audience is for the hero; otherwise he would not have been the hero. In many cases there may not be such a contrast. Even then there is a character with his associates who claims more of our sympathy than the others. The view expressed by that character or by those associated with him can be taken as what the dramatist himself thought of the point. The way in which the plot is developed is another test for determining the sympathy of the dramatist for any particular view.

When we read the *Śākuntala*, no one can deny the fact that we have some special sympathy for the great sage, Kanva and the minor character, namely, Anasuya among the two companions of the heroine. We need not attach much value to what the hero or the heroine might say. They are giving expression to what *they* feel as the right thing. Thus when the hero finds that the heroine is the daughter of the sage, and as such not fit to be the object of love for a king, since she must in that cases be a Brahmin girl, he tries to console his heart with the statement.

> Undoubtedly she must be fit for being the wife of a Kshatriya, because of the fact that even my noble heart is entertaining a desire for her; inded, in cases where there is a doubt in the minds of good people, the authority is the functioning of the mind.[17]

We need not attach much value to the opinion of the hero. From the beginning, we do not have any trust in the judgment of the hero; when he knew that the sage was not present in the hermitage and that only his daughter was there with the charge of entertaining the guests, his enthusiasm to go to the hermitage increases and after going into the hermitage, he hides himself behind a tree to watch the girls, a very unworthy act for any hero.[18] His personal interest in the situation takes away our trust in his judgment.

The great sage has no personal interests at all; such is the case with Anasuya, one of the companions of the heroine. She is free from personal interests and she is also serious. In the case of the other companion of the heroine, we may feel that she is a little jovial and liable to take things as not of a very serious nature. We have nothing but a feeling of reverence to Gautami, the sister of the great sage; but she does not come into the picture very much, so far as this point is concerned. Therefore we must interpret the philosophy of life in the *Śākuntala* in the light of the views expressed through the mouth of the great sage and of the companion of the heroine, Anasuya. Certainly we cannot ignore the way in which the plot is developed.

From the point of view of the plot, it is possible to so interpret the philosophy as to emphasise the undesirable nature of the physical side of the union of the hero and the heroine in the first part of the drama. The hero is a great king and it is against all canons of propriety that he should have courted the love of a girl in a hermitage especially when the sage was absent. Even when he entertained a feeling of love for her and when he found that his love was being reciprocated and also when he was satisfied that the heroine was fit to be his wife, he should have waited for the return of the foster-father of the heroine. The justification of such a union through mutual consent comes from the mouth of the hero, and he had nothing but his personal interest to look after, and he was trying to justify his actions. He was such an uncontrolled victim of his passions that he even tries to catch hold of the limbs of the heroine when they were left alone by the companions, and offers to rub the feet of the heroine when she was found to be much tired. Then he goes a step further. Here is the situation:

Heroine: Now, please leave me off. I like to consult the companions.

Hero: Let it be so, I will leave you.

Heroine: When

Hero: When, O charming lady, the nectar from your lips has been drunk by me with great softness when I am very eager about it, like the honey of a fresh flower by a bee, without hurting the beauty of that flower.[19]

It is a hero in such a condition that advises the heroine about the propriety of freedom between them at that moment in the form of:

> Many maidens of the family of royal sages have been heard of as having conducted their wedding through the method of marriage of *Gāndharva*[20] (by mutual consent) and also applauded by their parents.[21]

The action of the hero is really unworthy of a great king. He is a simpleton and he tries to find justification for everything that he desires to do.

The heroine also did not consult the elderly people of the hermitage and the sister of the sage says so when later she accompanied the heroine to the hero with a message from the sage to accept her as his wedded wife. She says:

> Your Majesty, I like to say something. There is no occasion for me to say anything. Thus is it: You did not wait for the father and she did not ask the relatives; in respect of what each of you have done, what can I say to either of you?[22]

The action of the hero and to some extent, the action of the heroine too, is not free from blemishes. They courted the nemesis in the form of the curse of a great sage, Durvasas who went to the hermitage; and the heroine neglected her duty by not noticing the arrival of such an honoured guest. This was followed by immense sorrow for both the hero and the heroine. It is their indiscrete conduct that brought them such a suffering.[23]

As against this interpretation, we must take note of what the sage Kanva has to say. He had gone out to a holy place, and when he returned, he was informed that Sakuntala had been married to Dushyanta, the great king. He had no resentment that such a serious step had been taken by the hero during his absence. He did not at all condemn her for such an act; on the other hand he was very happy over it and he complimented her for the choice. He says: "You have been united to the husband through fortune, whom it was that I had been thinking of from the beginning for you, who is quite appropriate for you."[24] Earlier, when he received the information about the marriage, he said to Sakuntala: "Through Providence, the offerings fell in the fire itself even when the eyes were blinded by the smoke. O child, you, like the learning bestowed on a worthy disciple, have become an object for no sort of regret."[25]

At this stage, the sage did not know of how Sakuntala had neglected her duty to a guset and how she had become the victim of a curse; even when he knew of it later through his supernatural powers, he did not get angry with any one. He knew that there was an element of Providence in the situation and there was no guilt attached to anybody. At the end of the story when Aditi, the wife of the great sage Maricha in whose hermitage the re-union took place, suggested that the news of the re-union be communicated to Kanva, Maricha said that through such supernatural powers Kanva was already aware of it, and the king also said that it must be on this account that he was not angry with him for discarding his daughter.[26]

Kanva evidently wanted Sakuntala to be the queen of the great king, and Providence was working along the same lines; the hero and the heroine were simply carried along the current through the working of that mighty Providence. In estimating the responsibility of the hero and the heroine in bringing about the suffering, we shall not ignore this point in the development of the plot in the drama. There is a physical element in a wedding, and rather an important element. In considering the development of the plot, we shall not also ignore the fact that Kanva received the news of the marriage through some divine mediation. As soon as the sage went to the apartment where the holy Fire was kept, there was some voice without a person to produce it: "O Holy Sage, understand your daughter as bearing the lustre placed in her by Dushyanta, for the prosperity of the world."[27] Here there is no hint of any element of impropriety in the course that led to their final union as husband and wife, and even gods have approved it. There is not even a hint that there is any unfortunate element in that union on account of its physical nature; the only factor that has been disapproved is that the father and the relatives had not been consulted.[28] But this comes from Gautami, whose vanity had been wounded in so far as the whole thing was done behind her back, even though she was in the hermitage, and next to the sage, she happened to be the greatest person there; and that sage was absent. When we closely examine the development of the plot, there is found to be no blemish atteched to their union either on account of the physical element or on account of the secrecy kept over it. Towards the close of the drama, Maricha also has not a word to say about either of these elements in their union. The question is not whether *we* disapprove any incident in the drama; the real question is whether any character in the drama for whom we have sympathy, in whom we have trust, has anything to say against the incident in it. How can we say that KALIDASA disapproved of the action of the hero and the heroine?

We are not interested in the events; we are interested only in the presentation of the events by KALIDASA. If KALIDASA had the least intention of hinting any disapproval of the union of the hero and the heroine with a physical element in it, how is it that he did not so handle the plot that at the time of the re-union of the hero and the heroine, the hero decided to retire from the world and go to the forest for penance, as had been indicated by Kanva when he took leave of his daughter at the time of her journey to the palace of the king? The hint is thus:

Heroine: Father, when will I be able to see this forest hermitage?

Kanva: Listen; having become for a long time the co-wife of the king along with the earth extending up to the four boundaries, having conducted the marriage of the son of Dushyanta who would be without an opponent, then, placing the burden of the family on him, you, my child, will once more take your abode in this hermitage along with your husband.[29]

The end of the drama is not according to this invitation. On the other hand, Maricha blesses them with long life extending over a hundred *Yugaṣ*, remaining the king of the country and performing sacrifices to please the inhabitants of heaven, and the inhabitants of heaven helping him with plenty and prosperity in the kingdom.[30] It is rather surprising that Maricha did not councel the king to place the crown on the head of the son and to retire from life after such mistakes and sufferings.

From the very beginning of the brama, we find that there is a preference to a full life on earth, marrying and leading a family life. When the king reached the gate of the hermitage, a disciple of the hermitage informed him that Kanva had gone on a pilgrimage to a holy place called Somatirtha in order that some unseen misfortune of Sakuntala might be warded off.[31] In the context, the misfortune can be nothing but that Sakuntala was not getting a suitable husband. This is a matter on which Kanva had been frequently remarking. When the king had met the heroine and her companions, the king asked them whether the father's desire was that Sakuntala should remain in the hermitage or that she should have a husband.[32] Priyamvada says: We are dependent on another (i, e. on the sage) even in the conduct of the daily routines of this place, that are of a holy nature. The father has some desire to give her in marriage to a suitable husband.[33]

Anasuya, the serious companion of the heroine, always helped her in the fulfilment of her desires. She knew that the sage had meant the heroine for some royal husband, and when such a one came, it was her duty to see that the hero and the heroine are united, which is the wish of the sage also. It is not merely the heroine, the two companions also were meant to return to their homes in the city or village and get married and lead a full life in a home. This is made quite clear in the scene where Sakuntala took leave of the hermitage. The heroine asked her father whether her two companions also could accompany her to the palace and the father says: "Child, these two also have to be given away (in marriage). It is not proper that they should go there.[34]

From all these references it is certain that in the whole drama there is no hint that it is a sin to have some physical element in the life of the normal people, and that the desire of the hero and the heroine to be united to each other is of the nature of a sin and a cause of suffering. It is a normel desire, approved by the sage; and there was only co-operation towards such a fulfilment from all the people in whom we have sympathy and in whom we have trust also for correct judgment. There is no reason to feel that the suffering that followed was the direct effect of any default on the side of the hero or the heroine and that they deserved it on account of their previous conduct.

Then, how is it that there was a curse? There is no doubt that the curse is closely related to the conduct of the heroine in respect of the hero. She was thinking of him and in that condition, she did not notice an honoured guest who came to the hermitage, and the result was that the curse was cast on the heroine through the wrath of the guest who was thus dishonoured.

In the beginning of the *Raghuvaṁśa*, there is a definite statement that king Dilipa failed in his duty to the celestial cow[35] and that he was deprived of the happiness of having a son on account of this deviation from the right path. It is said there: Indeed, deviation from doing honour to those who deserve to be honoured, brings obstacles in the path of welfare.[36] Here in the *Śākuntala* the great sage Maricha simply says: "Boy, there is no room for your fearing about any default on your part." When he narrates the incident of the curse of Durvasas, there is no hint that the curse was due to the deflection on the part of Sakuntala, from her duty. We should take note of the difference in the way in which the incident of a curse is mentioned here and in the *Raghuvaṁśa*. I Sakuntala had been in the wrong, there could have been such a mention by Maricha, as there is in the *Raghuvaṁśa* where Vasishtha refers to an incident of a curse.[38]

The curse here is not the consequence of any failure in duty on the part of the heroine; it is nothing but a wanton obstacle brought about on an innocent person by a person who had taken to the order of sages, who wore the robes of a sage, who lived the form of a sage, who had all the appearance of a sage, but who had no mental control, who had no sympathy for normal human weaknesses, who had a great sense of self-importance and of a superiority of himself, who was easily irritable and difficult to appease, devoid of fore-thought, having no sense of values and no balanced judgment. Durvasas is not introduced in the drama as an instrument for a just punishment which the hero and the heroine, especially the latter, deserved. He comes into the picture as a contrast to the great sage, the foster-father of the heroine, who is the ideal for a person who has renounced his life.

Kanva renounced life in order to help humanity, to devote all his powers for the welfare of humanity. He had no selfish motives and he had nothing that he wanted to get. He did nothing to gain any fruits for himself. He is unprovokable and he was full of sympathy for those who had the normal human weaknesses. He knew the world and its limitations and the needs of life in the world. Thus he says quite openly when he gives some advice to Sakuntala on the occasion of her farewell: Child, now you have to be instructed; we, though living in the forest, are well acquainted with the affairs of the world."[39] It is then that he gives the advice about her conduct in the palace.[40] The conduct of the hero and the heroine is what would have provoked strong objections from any ordinary person; in the absence of the lord of the place, a king came to the hermitage, made love to a girl and married her; and the heroine submitted to it. But Kanva was not moved by any sense of self-importance. He did not care for his own personal authority or personal prestige; all his interests were in the welfare of the foster-daughter. When he heard that during his absence something serious took place, which was a source of great happiness and future prosperity for her, he was full of joy. He lived a particular mode of life, he wore a particular dress. But he never insisted that others too should follow him in the mode of life and mode of dress, for ever. He prepared others, the foster-daughter and her two companions, for a sort of life quite different from his own. He gave them instructions in subjects like painting, which did not form part of the education for a person who is to live in a forest hermitage; the companions of the heroine say that they know the art of decoration from the experience they had in painting, though they were not accustomed to wearing ornaments in the forest.[41] Kanva was incapable of anger. He had nothing but forbearance and sympathy.

It is to show the contrast of this, in order to emphasise the glory of such a renunciation, that Durvasas was introduced. Kanva built up something through patience, and this irritable sage came and destroyed everything in a movement. He could not understand the beauty of life on earth. He knew only his personal importance. There is a beauty in the sorrow of separation, which Durvasas could not appreciate at all. Kanva says to himself:

> Because Sakuntala will go to day, my heart is struck with anxiety; my throat is being choked when I attempt to suppress my tears; my eyes have lost their life on account of thoughts of sorrow. Now to me the perplexity is so much, what a wonder! on account of attachment, though I am a resident of the forest. How much will a house-holder be afflicted by the new sorrows of separation from his own daughter?[42]

Durvasas knew the state of Sakuntala; he had no heart to understand and feel the grief of separation which she was suffering. He thought of only his own importance, and when in her sorrow, she did not notice him, he simply cursed her: "You think of some one; you give no room in your thoughts for anything else. I am a receptacle of penance and I have come here. But you do not take notice of me. Even if you remind him he will not remember you."[43]

How can we say that in developing the plot in this particular way KALIDASA was condemning the physical aspects of the normal life in this world? There is no normal life in this world without a strongly predominent physical side in it. What KALIDASA might have attempted is to show the contrast between true *Saṁnyāsa*[44] for helping humanity still remaining in the condition of normal life in this world and false renunciation where there is only an adoption of certain forms without any purity in the mind. The former builds and the latter destroys. It is the antethesis of these two forms of renunciation that KALIDASA makes prominent in the *Śākuntala*. There are only very few who have taken to real renunciation and who are working for the good of humanity, who build up something for the welfare of humanity. But there may be many who make a pretence of renunciation through their robes and external modes of life, but who think only of themselves and who destroy what others build up. It is this contrast that is very prominent in the way in which the plot in the *Śākuntala* has been developed.

The same doctrine about renunciation and its relation to life is elaborated in the Epic of KALIDASA, the *Kumārasambhava*. Here also there is the view expressed that love with a physical aspect brings about its own failure and even its own destruction, and that it is only penance and spiritual purity that can produce real and lasting happinesss for humanity. The main events in the story of the *Kumārasambhava* are that the king of the mountains named the Himalaya had a daughter who was known as Parvati (daughter of the mountain). The father wished to see that she became the wife of the great God, Siva; but being a very proud person, he did not want to approach the god with such a request, being afraid of rejection.[45] So he advised her to serve Siva, who at that time had undertaken a severe penance on the Himalayas.[46] The gods in heaven at this time were subject to the incursions and cruelties of the demons, and they approached the god Brahma for protection; Brahma said that the leader of the demons had received a boon from himself that he would not be defeated by the gods; he himself cannot undo what he had done. The only possibility is that there must be a son born to Siva, and only that son of Siva could destroy the demon. But Siva had undertaken a penance and he might not marry. The daughter of the Himalayas was serving him in his penance and if the gods could take steps to attract the love of Siva towards that maiden, then there is the possibility of the demon being killed by the son born of the union.[47] Then the lord of the heaven directed the Lord of Love (Kamadeva) to try his powers and he directed the Spring season to help him. When one day Parvati was in front of Siva, about to put a garland around his neck, Kamadeva discharged an arrow from a hiding place where he was watching for his chance. The Spring had already started, though it was not the proper time. Siva felt a change in his heart and looking around, he was able to see Kamadeva with his bow bent and on the point of discharging the arrow; the fire of wrath burst out of his eyes and Kamadeva was burnt to death and only some ashes remained.[48] This defeated all the attempts of the gods and this put an end to the hopes of Parvati. Then Parvati decided to take to penance to propitiate Siva; Siva was immensely pleased with her devotion and promised to accept her as his wife.[49] The great Himavan sent the seven great Sages as messengers to invite Siva formally to accept his daughter as his wife.[50] Everything was settled and the marriage was conducted on a grand scale.[51]

In this presentation of the theme of the epic, there is the prominence given to the failure of physical love and the success of spiritual pursuits in the form of penance. But how is it that KALIDASA actually develops the theme? Here also we must distinguish between the theme and the manner in which KALIDASA has handled it. In the hand of KALIDASA, the great god who had taken to eternal celebacy and penance is converted into a bride-groom, who enjoys a long honeymoon after the wedding.[52] We have to take 'note of the form which KALIDASA gives to the theme and not the bare outline of the theme on which he has worked for the creation of an art in the form of an epic.

In the northern regions there is the king of mountains named the Himalaya, in the form of a divinity.[53] He, the friend of the mountain Meru, married according to prescriptions the daughter, born of the mental powers, of the Dead Ancestors, named Mena, who was appropriate for himself in all ways, who was worthy of the honour even from the sages, in order that his family may continue,[54] because he knew the value of permanent social order. At that time, the daughter of Daksha who was formerly the wife of Siva, detroyed her body through her Yogic powers, being provoked to do so by the insult she had received from her own father, and being devoted to her husband, entered the womb of the wife of the mountain to be born again.[55] One day, the sage Narada, who moves about in the world freely, saw that maiden near her father and prophesied that she would be the sole wife of Siva and that on account of her devoted love, she would win for herself a half of his body.[56] Even though she was growing up, he withdrew from any desire for securing any other as her husband, for this reason.[57] From the very day when that beautifull lady had thrown off her body on account of the infuration of Daksha (her father in her previous birth) Siva had given up all attachments and decided to remain without a wife for the rest of his life.[58] He prepared a holy fire and kindled it with sacred fuel, and with some inscrutable desire he took to penance, though he was the dispenser of the fruits of penance, and though the Fire was only one form of himself,[59] since he was of eight-fold-form.[60] The mountain was not willing to persuade Siva, the god among the gods, to accept his daughter, unless he took the initiative to make a request for her hands.[61] So he directed her to worship him and to serve him, along with some companions, and though he knew that the presence of such a person is an obstacle to his penance, he permitted her to attend on him.[62]

This is the situation in which the epic is started. Siva was not averse to the fruition of the physical aspects of a married life. He took to penance because he lost his wife and he did not want to have a second woman as his wife. In the way in which Parvati is introduced into the presence of Siva, there is even a hint that his penance and his decision to have no other wife would turn out to be of a temporary nature and that he would again take to the normal life in the world with a wife and a home.[63] Denial of such a normal life became a necessity on account of the loss of the previous wife and not because it was considered the right thing to do under all conditions.

We do not know for what purpose he took to penance; KALIDASA is enigmatic about the real purpose. He simply says "For some objective."[64] There is one point that is clear, and that is that he took to penance on the top of the Himalayas; and Parvati is the daughter of the Himalayas. The choice of the place may have some relation to the objective he had in view in undertaking the penance. Thus the penance may be only an excuse for being near the place where that maiden was living. By penance he had nothing to gain; he is the dispenser of the fruits of penance and not the recepient. In the *Śākuntala*, the king asks his confidential companion, the *Vidūṣaka*, how he could spend some time in the vicinity of the hermitage where the heroine was living, and the companion says that under the pretext of collecting his royalties, he could spend some time there.[65] This may be some such pretext to be near the heroine of the epic. There is nothing in the context to show that any aversion to a physical union of the great God with the heroine is hinted at in the undertaking of penance by the God.

Siva was performing the penance, and Parvati was attending on him with her companions. Siva knew that Parvati would be no obstacle to his undertaking, though any other woman would be creating a hindrance to it by her presence; so he welcomed her attendence on him. It was into this context that the gods came and tried to attract the attention of Siva to Parvati. The demons were doing havoc in heaven and on the earth. Only a son born of Siva could save the world from this calamity. Here a marriage of Siva, so that a son could be born, is given as the only way for re-establishing safety for the world. How can we say that KALIDASA had entertained the doctrine that a physical aspect in the union of man with a woman is a sin and a cause for suffering? On the other hand it is explicitly said that it is the absence of a marriage and of a physical union that is the cause of suffering in the world. The gods interfered with this union of Siva with Parvati. They should have waited for the natural culmination of the event; but they took active steps in the matter, and that became an obstacle in the way of the fruition of the will of the God. This episode in the *Kumārasambhava* has some resemblence to the episode of the curse by Durvasas in the *Śākuntala*. What is an obstacle here is not any physical aspect in the desire of Parvati in her attitude towards Siva; it is the fact that this mutual longing, implied in the case of Siva[66] and expressly stated in the case of Parvati, was not allowed to take its natural course by the gods. Gods have no business in such matters.Nature must work out its ends.

There is one passage in the *Kumārasambhava* that requires some cereful thought; it runs: "O Lord, withdraw your wrath, withdraw—when there was this word uttered in the sky by the gods, at that time, that fire arising from the eyes of Siva, made the lord of love into a condition where only his ashes remained."[67] "He who was performing penance, cutting that obstacle of penance like Vajra cutting down a tree, desired to avoid the presence of women and disappeared from that place with his following."[68] Here the desire to avoid the company of women is expressly stated by KALIDASA, on the part of Siva. At the time when Siva started on his penance and when Parvati decided to serve him, there is the statement that she would be an obstacle to his penance.[69] Does not KALIDASA advocate a doctrine of aversion to and detachment from the world as a necessity for the attainment of some higher gaol for man?

Again I have to emphasise what I have already said on former occasions that we are dealing with what KALIDASA says about a point and not with the merits of the point itself. In the context there is not any statement that the presence of Parvati is an obstacle to penance. What is said is that the lord of love (Kamadeva) came in as such an obstacle, and that Siva put an end to that obstacle. He disappeared, but it is not stated that he actually left the place;[70] being devine, he can be present and at the same time, he can disappear. He did not want any one else to take any illegitimate advantage of the presence of women to be an obstacle to his penance. Perhaps he continued his penance in the place, without being visible to others. We do not know; one thing is certain and that is that KALIDASA does not say anywhere that Siva considered Parvati an obstacle and that he departed from the place where Parvati could be present.

When Kamadeva (Lord of Love) was destroyed and when Siva became invisible, Parvati went to her home and she decided to take to severe penance. She began to condemn her own physical beauty, because physical beauty has only one purpose, to secure the intense attachment of the lover.[71] She wanted to secure her physical beauty as unfailing in its purpose, through penance; how else could she secure both, a love of that nature and such a husband?[72] Here it is said that the purpose of penance is not to attain disembodiment and *Mokṣa*, but to secure a husband's love and a loving husband. At the end of the penance, Siva made his presence and made the declaration, "From now onwards, I have became your servant, charming lady; you have purchased me through this penance."[73] Read along with this, what could be the real significance of the former statement, "Being himself the dispenser of the fruits of penance, he took to penance for some unknown purpose?" And what is the place which Siva chose to perform his great penance? The place is described in the three verses preceding this verse. It is not presented as a fit place for any serious penance; it is more a place where a young couple could meet and make love to each other and finally agree to become husband and wife. There was the current of the river Ganges springling water on the *Devadāru* trees; there was the fragrance of musk, and the *Kinnaras*, a kind of demi-gods famous for their association with love, were making their sporting sound. His own attendants had worn the flowers of *Nameru* trees as decorations, and their robes made of the bark of *Bhūrja* trees were pleasant to touch; they sat on the rocks that were overgrown with herbs of sweet fragrance, smearing their bodies with colouring minerals. There was his bull making a sound expressing his deep feelings, bursting with his hoofs the snow heaped up as a thick rock, in his impatience, and the cow-animals were looking at him in a timid way. One cannot ignore the series of references to the objects and situations that provoke physical love in this description of the place chosen by Siva for his penance, and that indicates that the penance was not undertaken to attain to *Mokṣa*, but to secure some physical objective,[74]

The usual purpose in any one undertaking a penance is to attain *Mokṣa*, and he dispenses that fruit; he cannot be an applicant to it. Still he must have had some purpose in his own penance, which must be different from the usual one. That purpose must be that he should become the husband of Parvati. The word that KALIDASA uses to mean "purpose" is "*Kāma*," which is associated with physical attachment. KALIDASA is not the poet to use words in an indifferent way.

Taking everything into consideration, what we find is that KALIDASA recognises the value of penance, intensive withdrawal of all activities, making the body immune to the infleunces of the external conditions. But the value is in so far as it secures some worldly ends. The purpose of such penance is not to secure *Mokṣa*. Even the great God undertook penance for such a purpose, and he secured the daughter of the Himalaya as his wife, when she too undertook a severe penance for a similar purpose. Both were united to each other as husband and wife through such penance. Neither cared for, and neither attained to, *Mokṣa* through their penance.[75]

After the penance, Siva became a bride-groom and the daughter of the Himalayas became the bride in a grand wedding, which is described in great detail.[76] After the wedding a whole canto is devoted to the honey-moon.[77] They spent full one hundred years in that way, Siva enjoying the company of his newly wedded wife. KALIDASA closes the description of the honey-moon as follows: "Without the distinction of day time and night time, Siva remained attached to her for full one hundred years, and this long time elapsed like a single night; but he was not free from desire to continue his conjugal enjoyments in her company."[78] This is the fruit of penance performed by both for securing the union with the other. If even the great God, who took to renuciation and started on a penance with a vow of celebacy, returned to the stage of a house-holder, what should be the condition of the men in this world? KALIDASA is actually glorifying the normal life of a house-holder in this world, implying a condemnation of renunciation and penance for some other purpose like *Mokṣa*.

And *Mokṣa* comes to man as a fruit of intense activity, as in the case of Raghu; he lived a full and active life and even when he entrusted the work of ruling the country to his son, he continued his interest in the affairs of the country and was also ready to resume his personal work in the country if occasion should arise. Thus if somehow *Mokṣa* should come to a person, it is not through renunciation and retirement from activities; it is the fruit of work. And *Mokṣa* comes to a poet, and that is what is meant by the final benediction in the *Śākuntala*. In this benediction, KALIDASA does not pray for *Mokṣa* in the case of the people at large. In their case what he prays for is that the king should rule the country well and that culture should be dominent among them. For advocating such a doctrine, KALIDASA says that so far as he himself is concerned, he has become eligible for the highest benefit in the world. If cessation from life is that highest benefit, that is what *he* can claim for writing this drama. He does not claim this benefit for retirement, nor for inactivity; it is for advocating activity, and for leading a life of activity as a poet.

There is only one purpose in retirement. That is what we find in the case of Kanva; he is the ideal for retirement. In his retirement he is the most active in bringing about happiness for the people who still desire to live in this world in a state of activity and who desire to enjoy the fruits of labour. Even a real father, living in the homes with a family environment would not have been so much attached to a daughter as Kanva was to his foster-daughter. He was going about on his way when casually he saw an abadoned baby on the way-side and he picked up that baby and brought her up as his own daughter, perhaps with greater attachment. He educated her in such a way that she could occuppy the highest position in the country, to be the queen of the emperor; he worked for such a culmination. It is the responsibility of one put in charge of a daughter, to see that she is united to a worthy mate in life.

Life is noble in this world; retirement is to help others in that noble life; *Mokṣa* comes in as the fruit of activity. This is the philosophy of life, found in KALIDASA.

HARMONY

When historians talk about a revival of the Vedic religion in India after the fall of the Mouryan Dynasty in the beginning of the second century before Christ, they mean an effort on the part of the orthodox section of the people of India to restore certain institutions and certain ways of life which were prominent in the country in the Vedic times and which were exterminated by Buddhism, like animal sacrifice, caste system, priestcraft, the domination of the Brahmin class, the firm establishment of the ultimate authority of the Vedas, suppression of free thinking and associating the rituals of the Brahmin community with some mysterious significance. They call it the revial of *Brahmiṇism*. Pushyamitra is accepted as the king of the Magadha empire who brought an end to the rule of the Mouryan dynasty and who helped the re-establishment of the Brahmin domination in the county. In the *Ancient India*,[1] there is a denunciation of, what amounts to even a curse caste on, this great warrior for the sin of having removed the last of the Mouryan kings from the throne and for having established himself on it.

I have myself no partiality for Buddhism nor for any Religion when it gets decayed, being stuck on the personality of its Founder, with set doctrines that cannot develop, with Priests and with a Church; I have no dislike of the Vedic religion either, in so far as the Religion is allowed to move and to progress, unhampered by a Founder and free from Priests and from any organised Church. I have been able to find many-great factors in the Vedic way of life. My view is that this way of life had received a set-back and that there was also a revival. I for my part have no regrets that such an attempt was made for the *revival*, and that with considerable success. One of the noblest features in the Vedic thought was the spirit of harmony that pervaded it. Law harmonises and unifies; personality brings about conflict and separation. The Vedic people kept their religion independent of a person as founder, though we can find traces of a person who gave a form to the religion. There was Yama, the first discoverer of the ***Path*** beyond this life, who went through that Path and who becamee the king of that region beyond.[2] Yama remained one among the many personalities of the Vedic age while the religion prospered as a great institution. Manu established the religious rites that took men to that region beyond.[3] The rites were performed while Manu was only one among the many personalities and never received the honour as one above all. There were many ancient sages like the Atharvans and the Angiras and the Atris who were associated with Yama and Manu, the two brothers, the sons of Vivasvat. The religion always remained above such personalities and new sages come into the picture who followed the traditions set by the earlier sages and continued and progressed the ways of life established by such early sages. But the personality of no sage, however eminent he be, however rich his contribution be to the religion, was allowed to dominate the religion though a large number of sages established certain schools and family traditions.[3] When a personality is allowed to be the dominant factor in a religion, the disciples who present the religion begin to differ on what the orthodox teaching of the founder of the religion would be; the religion starts splitting up and disintegrating into sects. The sectarian differences deteriorate into conflicts. But when there is no such dominating personality, differences become an integral factor in the religion, and such differences, being integral and natural, blend into a harmonious whole. Since Yama and Manu and the ancient sages did not acquire the status of the "Founders of the Vedic Religion," the religion remained unified. Harmony among the *differents* bocame a cardinal point in the Vedic thought. The *Atharvaveda* speaks of the earth bearing humanity that never overcrowded[4] and that spoke different languages and followed different religious practices.[5] At the end of the *Ṛgveda* there is a hymn on harmony, where people are called upon to come together, to think in harmony and to speak in harmony.[6]

In KALIDASA, as in the *Mahābhārata* and in the *Rāmāyaṇa*, we find a reflection of the spirit of the Vedic age, an effort to revive the spirit of the Vedic culture when it had received a set-back. KALIDASA's portraits of the kings and of the common people and of women, of Nature and of heaven and earth truly represent the Vedic mode of thought on such points. Here is another Vedic spirit reflected in KALIDASA in the form of harmony. When the great German poet Goethe found in the *Śākuntala* of KALIDASA a happy blending of the various seasons of flowers and of fruits and all things that nourish and satisfy along with heaven and earth,[7] he truly represented this aspect of the Vedic spirit reflected in the works of KALIDASA; but he had no notion of the Vedas and he had no information about the historical back-ground of the works of KALIDASA. It is noteworthy that what struck Goethe is this spirit of harmony, this happy blending of *differents* that are seldom seen together in this world. It is only a poet that can blend such different things into a harmonious whole. We find in the works of KALIDASA people playing their part in environments in which we do not see them in this actual world; we find in people characteristics differing from one another, not often seen together in the same person in this world. We find beings from different planes of the world coming together and moving together as if they belonged to the same plane. And yet we find nothing that is unnatural, nothing that creates a dissatisfaction in our minds.

First let us look at the kings who are portrayed in the works of KALIDASA. Most of the points that I propose to introduce in this lecture, have already been dealt with in different contexts in previous lectures; what I can do here is only to collect them and bring them round the main point taken up in this lecture. In the *Raghuvaṁśa* we find king Dilipa as an ordinary person living in the forest and tending a cow there. We see nothing of a palace or things relating to a king in a palace like his ministers and his army and the women in the harem and the luxury of golden thrones studded with gems, feudatory kings offering rich presents, and bards singing the glories of the king. We find him undertaking a humble journey through a forest with a small retinue. There are no officers of the State escorting him or making rich arrangements for his stay; on the other hand, it was definitely stated that although his host in the forest, the sage Vasishtha, could secure all the things needed to give him a royal reception on account of his supernatural powers acquired through long penance, he made only the usual arragements for him in his hermitage for his stay.[8] Although Dilipa was a king, he fitted very well into this environment of the forest with the common folk and the inmates of the hermitage of the great sage. Such an environment did not in any way prejudice his status as a great king. The reception that he received from the objects of Nature like the trees and the creepers and the animals and the birds and the wind was grander than anything that he could have enjoyed in the city. He admired the beauty of Nature away from the palace and the royal paraphernalia, and was a far greater king for this reason. The common people came face to face with this great king. The forest nymphs sang his glories sitting in the bowers. A great king in such humble environments is what we do not see in the world.

It is in the same situation that we find in the drama *Śākuntala*, the hero, the great king Dushyanta during a hunting expedition. By chance he went to the hermitage of the great sage Kanva; instead of going in and accepting the usual offerings of honour and a fitting reception, he removed his ornaments and other symbols of his high rank and concealed himself behind a tree to watch the movements of three girls who were watering the plants around the hermitage. He waited until he got what he considered a fit occasion to present himself, and then also he prefered to talk to the girls freely and did not want any formal reception there. In this situation, rather unnatural to a great king, we find him really lovable. The fact is that the position that the kings usually hold in the world is unnatural; KALIDASA is presenting even a king in the natural surroundings of the world in which alone a king becomes a man whom we can like. It is from the point of view of the customs and manners of the world of conventions that the king is placed in an unnatural situation in the hermitage, talking to the simple girls there instead of accepting a formal reception usually given to a royal guest. From that point of view there is something that is mutally conflicting between the man and his environment; KALIDASA brings in the point of view of the poet, and thereby he reconciles the two, and there is harmony between the king and the environment in his poetry.

It is as a contrast to this that KALIDASA introduces the same king in what is supposed to be his natural environment, the palace with some of his ofiicers.[9] Here we find some unhappy element in the whole situation. The king as a man is found a misfit in that environment. He has lost his freedom, he becomes very particular about forms and about ceremonies; he loses all his human traits, and is devoid of any understanding of human nature. The simple, jovial, informal and free man has become a king in the palace tied down by conventions and rules of etiquettes, unable to take a descision and depending on his officers to come to any decision in matters before him.[10]

Dilipa in the *Raghuvaṁśa* and Dushyanta in the *Śākuntala* present one set of harmony between what are supposed to be irreconcilables in this world of conventions. In Raghu in the *Raghuvaṁśa* we find another kind of harmony. As a king he is portrayed as a great hero, valiant, well-trained in arms and victorious in all his martial undertakings. But KALIDASA does not present such a hero in the environments that are generally accepted as natural for him. He passes on from country to country, and everywhere we find the description of Nature as the most prominent feature in the situation. And it is the soft aspects of Nature that we find in the descriptions, except in the description of the Himalayas. Here too there is an apparent conflict between the man and his environment. But we feel no such conflict in the actual situation as painted by the poet. The impression that we get is that the hero is in the most fitting environment. The occasional hints about the army and the battles and the victories remind us of the fact that we are dealing with a valiant martial hero, and the more dominating descriptions of Nature give us the picture of a real human being whom we love, whom we are not afraid of for his martial exploits. In the case of his son also, we find the harmony between the soft nature of a human being and the spirit of martial heroism. The adventure with the elephant on his way for the wedding in the Vidarbha country[11] and his fight with the disppointed princes who waylaid him on his return journey after the wedding[12] show him to be an ideal hero with all martial qualities. And at the same time, we find him mainly as a bride-groom and as a devoted husband.

We find Aja, the son of Raghu, in whom martial exploits and soft human emotions are harmonied, mostly in the palaces and sometime outside the palace in royal environments. In the case of Dilipa and Dushyanta, there is a sort of suppression of the symbols of royalty. In the case of Raghu, it is a subordination of royalty to the nature of a common man. It is in the case of Aja, the son of Raghu, that we find a happy blend of the two. This feature we find in the counterpart of the Aja of *Raghuvaṁśa* in the drama *Mālavikāgnimitra,* namely, Agnimitra. Dilipa and Dushyanta represent a pair; similarly Aja and Agnimitra form another pair. Agnimitra is presented to us in his palace environments with his ministers and his army chiefs. We see some diplomacy, some threats to the enemy kings. We hear reports of battles and victories. Side by side with this, we find Agnimitra as a soft natured human being, responsive to the common feelings of men like love for women. He is both a warrior and also a suitor to a young maiden living in the palace. It is this blend of the two natures that gives the real beauty to the drama. There is an intertwining of two plots in the drama, one a political adventure, and the other a love episode. Neither of them does prejudice the other; on the contrary each contributes to the fulfilment of the other. The apparent conflict is not between heroism and love; they go together. The real conflict thst is possible, is between the political strategy and the love intrigue. One engaged in a political diplomacy cannot be expected at the same time to fulfill the requirement of love-making, and the latter is really an obstacle to the former. That is what the queen says towards the close of the first Act in the drama, when she rebukes the king with the remark that if he had exhibited a similar cleverness in State matters too, that would have been proper.

Dilipa and Dushyanta were friends of the Lord of the heaven and they paid occasional visits to him also; sometimes in battles with the demons, their aid was also sought by the Lord of the heaven. But such relation with the heaven is only hinted at and does not form a prominent factor in the description, in the delineation of the two characters. They are all behind the scene, so to speak. It is in the case of Raghu that we find the king of the earth in direct relation with the Lord of the heaven. They fight against each other in open battle, and the earthly hero is not defeated.[14] There is on the face of it a lack of match between the parties that are brought face to face with each other; yet at the same time we find the hero from the earth quite an equal of the hero from the heaven. There are also frequent suggestions that the hero from the earth is morally superior to the hero from the heaven while he is not inferior in martial qualities.

Raghu of the *Raghuvaṁśa* has his counterpart in the drama *Vikramorvaśiya,* in the person of the king Pururavas. Indumati and Sakuntala, the heroines of the epic *Raghuvaṁśa* and the drama

Śākuntala, are only semi-celestial, having their origin in heaven. But as seen in the poems, they are earthly beings. It is in the *Vikramorvaśīya* that we see a pair, one from the earth and the other from the heaven, brought to each other; and both live together on the earth, as husband and wife. Although it is in different cantexts, there is some sort of resemblance between Raghu and Pururavas, in so far as both come face to face with beings from the heaven. According to the notion of the times when KALIDASA lived and wrote his poetry, the interests of the earth and of the heaven are in conflict with each other. And yet here we find a hormony between the two conflicting elements in the poetry of KALIDASA.

The six kings found in the *Raghuvaṁsa* and in the three dramas represent one kind of the harmonious blending of the apparently conflicting elements in this world. This is not the really high type of the art of harmony which KALIDASA has been able to achieve in his poetry. That is only the minor aspect in his art. The real process of harmonising the elements that are accepted as conflicting with each other, is found in the delineation of the character of Kanva in the *Śākuntala* and of Siva in the *Kumārasambhava*. KALIDASA finds nothing but harmony between the world in which we live and the interest of the world that man is taught to look for after death as a fruit of a certain mode of life on earth.

The world is, according to a certain system of religious teaching, an abode of sin, a result of sin and a cause of suffering. The three goals of man, three values of man, represented by *Dharma* (virtue), *Artha* (acquisition) and *Kāma* (enjoyment) are aspects of an imperfect mode of living. They come within what is called the *Pravṛtti Mārga* (the Path of Activity). There is the final goal, the ultimate value, in beatitude (*Mokṣa*) and the Path to that destination is of the form of *Nivṛtti* (Detachment). Both the *Advaita* and the religion of Buddha accepted this principle, though there is a fundamental difference 'between them in the matter of the form of beatitude. They had the institution of *Saṁnyāsa* (Renunciation). Acceptance of this institution of *Saṁnyāsa* without any reference to the actual life in the world represented by the institution of a house-holder's life, was a common factor in these two systems of religious beliefs. Those who join the order of Monks after *Saṁnyāsa* (Renunciation), give up all religious rites, and they withdraw from the activities of life on the secular plane also. Even in cases of activities that cannot be given up, there is the absence of *Śraddhā* (Attachment) to both the act and the fruit of the act. In the other two schools of *Vedāntā* represented by the *Viśiṣṭādvaita* and *Dvaita* (Qualified Monism and Dualism), there is no denunciation of activity. The system of *Saṁnyāsa* found a place in those two schools also. But they accepted the sanctity of active life following the prescriptions of the Vedas; to them, *Mokṣa* came in due course after leading such a life, and as such, life and *Mokṣa* become a unit. But they too accepted *Mokṣa* as the true and final goal. To that extent there is an element of imperfection in our life on earth according to these systems. The perfection of the state of *Mokṣa* comes in through *Saṁnyāsa*. The doctrine of the imperfect nature of the world and life in the world is common to all the schools of the *Vedānta* and to Buddhism. They all advocate the ideal of *Nivṛtti* (Detachment) from the world and the doctrine of a final escape from this imperfection at the state of *Mokṣa*.

It is in the system of thought in India known as *Mīmāṁsā* that we find a different mode of thinking in respect of the nature of the world and our relation to the world. The world is perfect; the world is governed by a perfect law. The imperfection is only in the elements of this perfect world and in the way in which we work out the law. Such an imperfection in the elements constituting the perfect world is natural; otherwise they cannot be *constituent* elements. The *Advaitins* accept each such element as the perfect whole itself in actual fact. The *Viśiṣṭādvaitins* accept the perfect whole with the imperfect elements as its parts, and something more.[15] At the stage of realisation of the imperfect elements as parts of the perfect whole, there is some sort of infused perfection in the parts too. In the *Dvaita* system, they accept the Perfect One[16] as something different from the imperfect multiplicities; but they can overcome the unhappiness due to their imperfection by the realisation of their relation as Master and servants. In these two latter systems, the imperfection of the individuals as individuals continue; but a perfect bliss is possible through the Grace of the Supreme One. It is here that the *Mīmāṁsā* differs from all such systems.

The *Mīmāṁsā* system does not equate imperfection with suffering. It does not also accept a migration from imperfection to Perfection. Every imperfect part of the perfect whole has a locus and a function in the whole system that works on a perfect Law. One must understand this Law and move along the right path according to his locus and his own function. One who realises the true nature of this perfect world and its perfect Law enjoys perfect bliss. For one who has this realisation, there is nothing to be sought after for himself; he simply functions and yet appears to be free from functioning. What is generally experienced as function is the effort to avoid the consequences of moving along wrong paths. Movements along the right path, free from any hitch or jerk, cease to appear as movements and look like inactivity. They function only to help others in avoiding the conflicts brought about by movements along wrong paths, and this is done by showing them the true path along which they can move without such conflicts. The goal is not to cease functioning; it is to move along the right path. It is this *Mīmāṁsā* principle that we find taught by KALIDASA in his *Śākuntala* through the character of Kanva. Knowing the right path for movement in his own case and also in the case of others, to Kanva there is only a perfect harmony in this world. He never comes into conflict with any one else; although the character of Maricha is not presented in so much detail,[17] he too represents this same ideal. Dushyanta and Sakuntala represent the types of ordinary people who do not know the right path and who are under the guidance of the right sort of teacher in the person of Kanva. Left to themselves, they would have been hitting against each other. But under the guidance of the true teacher who has known the harmony in this world, they move along the right lines and escape the consequence of movements along the wrong paths. Ultimately they are united to each other, and along with a son born to them, they spend a happy life for a long time. That is the right path shown to them by Kanva, and the right path takes them to True Happiness.

The charactor of Kanva illustrates the doctrine that there is no real *Saṁnyāsa* for any one in this world, unless it is a false *Saṁnyāsa*. It is after Kanva became a Sage that he became very active also. He could devote all his energy for helping humanity, for rendering guidance and assistance to those who do not know the truth about the world, who are not able to discriminate between the right and the wrong paths. It is not a stage of *Nivṛtti*, a stage of cessation of activities that we call true *Saṁnyāsa*. It is a stage of very intense activity. Kanva never made any mention of withdrawal of activities from the affairs of the world, of attainment of heaven or release as the goal for his foster-daughter. He was always talking of a suitable companion in life for her, and he was also thinking of such a culmination for her stay in the hermitage. There is a casual reference to a possibility of her return to the hermitage at a later stage when she would have completed her obligation to the affairs of the State, after installing her son on the throne.[18] But that was more a word of solace for her at the time of her departure from the hermitage, and he could never have meant it seriously; at any rate we do not see any such event taking place in her life. What took place was quite the opposite of it; she stayed on in the palace along with her husband and her son.

According to the conventions and the beliefs of the time when KALIDASA wrote, Kanva should have had no care for the affairs of the world. When such a person is portrayed as being immersed in the complications of a home, there is an apparent contradiction between the character and his environment. KALIDASA cleverly manages the theme in such a way that we find this sage of eternal celebacy as the fondest parent, worrying about the future happiness of a worldly nature for his foster-daughter. The fond parent never loses any of his serious aspects as a great Sage and the seriousness of the Sage does not prejudice his anxious love for the daughter.

It is as a contrast to Kanva that KALIDASA has introduced the other Sage Durvasas, who had all the external symbols of *Saṁnyāsa* but who was more inextricably involved in the complications of the world than any "man of the world;" he does not know the true path for men to traverse in this world and he brings obstacles in the way of those who were guided by the true sage Kanva. But ultimately, such false *Saṁnyāsins* fail, and it is the path shown by a *Saṁnyāsin* like Kanva that triumphs in the world. In this harmonious presentation of a double nature in the same person, namely, the nature of a hermit and the nature of a house-holder, without any prejudice to either of them, we find the real genius of KALIDASA. The contrast to him in the person of Durvasas who is neither a hermit in the real sense of the word nor a house-holder, makes the art brighter. Durvasas is false to his profession and an obstacle to the world which he is supposed to have renounced.

A still greater success of KALIDASA as an artist in effecting the harmony between the apparently conflicting factors in this world is illustrated by the delineation of the character of Siva in the epic *Kumārasambhava*. Usually in the world, all gods are males. If there is any female deity in the pantheon, only a subordinate position is assigned to such a deity. Religion, which presents gods, is narmally an affair of men, and women are kept out of it. But the Vedas in India give us a different picture. In the Vedas we find a religion *for humanity*, not a religion *of men*. This spirit continued in the latter-day growth of religion in the country, when much of foreign matter also had to be absorbed by, and assimilated into, it. All the divinities even in this latter-day religion of India were associated with a female counterpart. There are various love episodes current in the tradition of the country connected with such divinities. Every religion associates their divinities with virtues which they themselves consider the most sacred in their tenets. It is when women are considered a seat of sin and a cause of suffering in the life of man and when avoidance of relationships with women is accepted in the religion as a necessary step in their progress towards the ultimate goal, that their gods are also dissociated from women. But in a religion which is meant *for humanity*, consisting of men and women as equals, marriage and domestic life are accepted as the noblest forms of virtues in the life of men. Therefore gods also have a home-life with their wives and with their children. They have their love affairs also.

There is a tradition of literary criticism in India which forbids the association of divinities with passions like love. But the poets are not restricted in their choice of their theme and in their treatment of the theme to any narrow range by writers on literary art. ANANDAVARDHANA in his *Dhvanyāloka* discusses this point in detail and he cites various examples from literarure to show how poets have gone astray from this restriction without breaking the laws of propriety.[19] Vishnu the great god of the Indian religion, is known to have come down to the earth in various forms; two of the latest are in the form of Shri Rama and Shri Krishna. In both the Incarnations, they had their wives also in the person of Sita and Rukmini respectively. The story of Shri Rama and of Shri Krishna are full of love episodes. There is no element of anti-femininism in the religion centering round Shri Rama and Shri Krishna. But the other great God of the religion of India, Siva, is closely associated with asceticism and anti-femininism. This God is presented in the literature relating to religion in India in a two-fold way, each in conflict with the other. He is a great *Yogin*, a god dedicated to penance, wearing serpents on his arms and on his neck and on his head, clad in the skin of an elephant, smearing ashes on his body and carrying a trident in his arms. As against this terrible form there is also presented the other aspect of the same God as being the husband of Parvati, as sharing a single body with her as half and half and also carrying Ganga (the ganges) on his head as a belowed. KALIDASA speaks of him in the first benedictory verse of his drama the *Mālavikāgnimitra* as one "who though mixed up with his consort in the same body, is in the forefront among those dedicated to penance with their mind free from the pleasures of the world."[20] Usually these two qualities do not go together. KALIDASA found only harmony in this contradiction and that theme is fully developed in his epic the *Kumārasambhava*.

Siva had married one of the daughters of Daksha; but she ended her life on account of an insult from her own father in so far as her husband did not follow the usual modes of life accepted as the right one for a householder, in the matter of dress and other things. She was again born as the daughter of the great king among the mountains, the Himalayas; she grew up to be the most handsome girl imaginable. But after the death of his wife, Siva himself took to penance on the banks of the river Ganges high up in the Himalayas. The place chosen was the most charming, fit for enjoying life and not for penance. This is how the story is introduced. We find that slowly this hermit is converted into a lover who agrees to marry that girl,[21] and then he becomes an attractive bride-groom for a grand wedding;[22] after the wedding he spends a hundred years in full enjoyment of the campany of the newly wedded wife; and yet his desires for such enjoyment did not subside.[23] The various elements in the costume of the hermit are converted into the costume of a bride-groom.[24]

Even after this transformation into a handsome bride-groom, who is generally a decorated idol to be looked at and admired by the crowd, Siva continued as the great god. The description of this bride-groom is worthquoting: Then, the heavy sound of drums played as a symbol of the auspicious occasion, by the retinue that went in advance of Siva who had his trident, announced to the gods the time for them for paying their respects, by reaching up to the aerial vehicles of the gods. Then the Sun held the Umbrella above his head, which had been specially made for the purpose by the divine architect. The two rivers Ganges and Jumna, assuming corporeal bodies, held the *Cāmara* fans and served him in that capacity. The First Creator, Brahma and the great Vishnu with his *Śrīvatsa* mark on his chest, advanced towards him, increasing his grandeur with their shouts of "Victory to Thee". The Lords of the Cardinal Points of the world, with Indra, the Lord of heaven at their head, wearing modest dress, casting away all symbols of their high positions, indicated their desire to present themselves before him through their looks, and when Nandin, his Guard, gave the signal, they prostrated before him with closed hands. He greeted Brahma, the Creator with a shake of his head, with a word to Vishnu, with a smile to Indra and with a general look to all the gods.[25]

KALIDASA wanted to show in his epic that there is nothing irreconsilable between the great god and the love affairs of the world. As a matter of fact, the great god leading the life of an ordinary house-holder becomes far greater than when he was leading the life of a hermit. The noblest, the loftiest and the most sacred life can be lived in the life of a house-holder. If this is so among the gods, if this is so in the case of the great God, the life of a house-holder in the case of men cannot be an object of condemnation, nor can it be decried as a snare and as an obstacle to the realisation of the highest goal in life. It is this harmony between the worldly life and the perfect life, that is taught in the epic *Kumārasambhava*.

Indian tradition is full of this philosophy of life taught by KALIDASA. In all the types of poetry in Sanskrit we come across references to the love episodes in the life of Siva. There is a story about BHAVABHUTI, the reputed dramatist in Sanskrit literature, how he got that name. It is said that he is called *Bhavabhūti* because the word occurs in a verse he composed about Siva and Parvati. I have already given that verse in the first lecture, when I dealt with the names of poets in Sanskrit Literature like KALIDASA, BHAVABHUTI and BANA. I do not know whether such a statement about God would be permitted in any other country with another religion. In the beginning of the drama *Mudrārākṣasa* by VISAKHADATTA, there is the benedictory verse in which the theme is a discussion between Siva and Parvati, how Parvati was jealous about Ganga (Ganges) on the head of Siva, how Siva was trying to conceal her and how he was trying to evade the inconvenient questions of Parvati. The love affairs between Siva and Parvati form the subject matter for many a gem in Sanskrit literature.

I do not know how the story of Siva and Parvati came into the literature. In the Veda we have Rudra and Rudrani (his consort). But nothing is know in the Veda about Parvati (daughter of the mountain) being the wife of Siva. But the belief that he was not a bachelor goes back to the Vedic times. In presenting this aspect of harmony in this world, KALIDASA is also reviving a Vedic belief among the people.

There is another very important character in the works of KALIDASA who also, like the Sage Kanva and the God Siva, represents the harmony between the world and renunciation from the world. Really, the conflict is between worldliness and renunciation, and between the world and renunciation there is only harmony. This character is so very important that I should have dealt with the point even before the other two characters, and that is the character of Pandita Kaushiki in the *Mālavikāgnimitra*. We usually accept her as having joined the Buddhistic Monastic Order. All that she says is that she adopted the "yellow robes," and the name of Buddha or of the Order is not mentioned in the drama. Perhaps KALIDASA has introduced this character with a vengeance. Kanva the great Sage, was always worried about securing a husband for his foster-daughter and Siva the Great God, himself becomes a lover and a bride-groom, spending a long honey-moon after the wedding. This lady, a member of the Monastic Order, becomes the most active agent in bringing about the union between the hero and the heroine in the *Mālavikāgnimitra*. She has herself renounced the world; but instead of securing converts to her newly adopted way of life and to the Order which she joined, she involves herself in a conspiracy to arrange a meeting between the hero and the heroine and finally manages to bring about the marriage of the hero with the heroine. This is the role played by all the lady members of the Order, introduoed in the Sanskrit dramas, like Kamandaki in the drama, the *Mālatīmādhava* of BHAVABHUTI.

The harmony between royal position and the position of the common people, harmony between the inhabitants of the earth and the inhabitants of heaven, harmoney between heroism and the position of a lover, harmony between the position of a hermit and that of a house-holder, and harmony between a great God dedicated to eternal celebacy and his wedding at a later stage: these are the main points in the presentation of harmony by KALIDASA. He always takes two factors that are accepted as mutually conflicting and then he shows their possible harmony. There are places where he speaks of harmony between the irreconcilables and the value of such harmony in the affairs of the world. Thus, he often speaks about the culture and wealth being irreconcilable, how they are not found to exist in the same abode and how in some exceptional cases they are found together, as in the case of the Anga King in the *Raghuvaṁśa.*[26] He prays for such existence in the same place of wealth and culture, at the close of the drama *Vikramorvaśīya* so that there might be plenty and happiness among the good people. The same idea is suggested in the final Prayer in the other two dramas, the *Śākuntala* and the *Mālavikāgnimitra*. This point has been dealt with in a previous lecture.

KALIDASA has anticipated Sankara's *Advaita* (Momism) in his presentation of harmony. The main difference between KALIDASA and Sankara is that while Sankara presents his doctrines from the point of view of a rationalistic philosopher to meet the rationalistic Nihilists and *Apohavādins* (these who accept the difference as the real thing), KALIDASA presents his doctrine from the point of view of an artist. Ultimately both reach the same position; that the world is of the nature of undifferentiated Bliss *(Ānanda)*. There is difference when we do not see the truth. What is called differentiation is not an absolute untruth; it is a partially known truth. It is in this world of experienced difference that we can see the truth of harmony, unity and beauty. We should not condemn this world of differences; we must try to understand it in its real nature.

It is when there is this differentiation and when this differentiation is experienced, that there is the occasion to think of a unity as the real truth. If there had been only an infinity and a unity, there would have been no doctrine of *Advaita*. Thus what is called differentiation is not something to be discarded or ignored. Similarly, differences have a great value in art also. There is no art without the differences. Art is the unity in the *differents*. The greater the difference, the greater is the scope for art. This is clear in the art of music and in the art of painting. Music is the harmony in notes that are far apart. What are termed *Saṁvādi Svaras* (concordant notes) are what lie far apart in the scheme of notes. Neighbouring notes are not accepted as concordant in the science of music. Similarly, in painting also there is greater art if there are greater differences in the colours that are used. There must be the contrast of colours presented in such a way that there is a pleasing harmony. That is art.

In the same way, for a poet also, the differences form the best material for his art. A king in his palace is not the proper theme for poetry. Gods in heaven and men on earth in themselves do not give sufficient scope for a poet to present his art. Poetic art consists in presenting facts in environments in which they are not usually found, in environments that are accepted as in conflict with those facts, according to our conventional notions of the nature of the world. A poet does not present the facts of Nature in the way in which they are known to us; he is not a mere mirror. What he does is to present the Nature in a way in which we are not able to see it, in a way that is its real nature as seen by the artist. Harmony, Beauty and Bliss or aesthetic enjoyment go together; they form a single unity also.

KALIDASA lived at a time when defferences and negations ruled the thoughts of philosophers. What we actually experience in a positive thing is not its positive nature, but only its negative nature in the form of its differences from all others. This is what is known in Indian philosophy as *Apoha* (difference) *Vāda* (doctrine). However high may be its rationalistic value, it has a great adverse nature in the actual world. Every one is not a philosopher and is not able to realise the philosophic values of an opinion. But he is influened by its phenomenal aspects. If differences in the world are glorified as the only truth, organisation of social life is sure to breakdown. And such has been the effect of that doctrine in India. The tendency among the people would then be to get divided and sub-divided, ignoring their common interests. That is what is called social disruption. The goal of every one becomes what can be reduced to a void, a zero (*Śūnya*). When the place where we are is condemned as an abode of sin and suffering, people are eager to escape, and in such an effort to escape, the interest of one's own self dominates all other considerations. If the nature of the individual is its difference from all others, this makes the effort for the attainment of a common goal by a common effort an impossibility. The nation, once united by the Vedic ideals, got itself diversified and divided into conflicting groups. The doctrine of harmony developed in the works of KALIDASA from the point of view of an artist, has this great ethical importance also, this great sociological importance.

The importance of the works of KALIDASA does not lie in its being an object of curiosity for the specialists in aesthetics. There is a great practical side also in it. I am not at all asserting that KALIDASA noticed the disruption in the Indian nation on account of the prevalence of the dectrine of Nihilism and differences, and that he wrote his poems with an eye to finding out a remedy for this social malady among the people. I draw a distinction between a set purpose and an effect. Whether one keeps the effect before one's eyes as a set purpose or not, the effect will be there. The effect lies in the art; the purpose of the artist is only to produce the art. The Vedas moulded the life of the people because they form first class art. In the same way the later specimens of literature like the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Mahābhārata* moulded the lives of the people on account of their artistic eminence. KALIDASA's works too had the same effect. Perhaps there is no literature in the world that has influenced the life of the nation to the same extent as the Vedas, the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Mahābhārata* and the works of KALIDASA.

The harmony presented in the works of KALIDASA slowly, and perhaps unconsciously, developed a sense of unity among the nation. A tendency grew up to ignore the differences and to attach a great importance to the harmony found among the *differents* in the world. The poetry of KALIDASA had a special influence, not produced by the other poets; and KALIDASA began to be counted along with VALMIKI (the author of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, and VEDA VYASA (the author of the *Mahābhārata*). That is how KALIDASA become the greatest poet of India. And to Goethe it is this harmony that appealed most in the *Śākuntala*.

As I have alredy hinted earlier in this lecture, it does not require any extraordinary poetic talent to describe a king in the palace or the gods in heaven or a hermit in the forest. The genius of a poet exhibits itself when a poet succeeds in describing a king in the natural surroundings of a forest or in describing a hermit as a devoted and fond parent or in describing the gods and the human beings coming together and moving together. There is some apparent conflict and it is the poet who conceals the conflict in his art and presents a harmony. That is the greatness of KALIDASA as a poet.

OUR INDIA

India is the name applied to a territory where grew up a certain religion and a certain way of life from very ancient times. There was no attempt on the part of the people who developed this religion and this culture, to inflict it on the people of other regions. They stoutly, and with creditable success, resisted the attempts on the part of their neighbours to invade the country and to establish their political and cultural domination over them. The Vedas which form the earliest literature from which we can have an idea of their civilization, remained the basis of the religion within this territory, which religion never spread beyond its borders. Along with the religion, as there should be in the case of every religion, there grew up certain ceremonials also. If any one puts the question, "What is India?" there is no difficulty to answer the querry; one can give the reply, "India is the territory where such ceremonials are observed." Thus we can find out if the people know the *Gāyatrī* passage from the Veda, which every follower of that religion recites day after day. It is recited by all who belong to the territory and it is not recited by any one outside of that territory. If any one in India does not recite it, he does not strictly belong to the country; he came from outside, either himself or his ancestors, and did not become naturalised in the country. The test of naturalisation is that he knows the *Gāyatrī* passage and that he recites it in his daily ceremonials. Certain religious rites like the Soma offering, certain sacraments like the *Upanayana* (initiation to study), certain sacred passages for daily recitation like the *Gāyatrī*: they form the most ancient forms of religious worship among human races, which survived even to this day. Even in the present age, there may be decay; there is no destruction to them.

The region known by the name India, continued more or less with the same extent. There has been fluctuations only on the western side. We do not know the exact extent of the region where the Vedic culture prevailed. Scholars hold that the region was confined to the Punjab (the land of the five rivers) and the neighbouring parts. Some rivers that form this "Five-river" scheme are found in the Vedas; there is also the mention of the seven rivers (*Sapta Sindhu*) in the Vedas. All attempts to fix this number with reference to specific rivers have failed. Yet scholars are unanimous in their view that the Five-river system of the Punjab must be equated with this Seven river system mentioned in the Vedas. Some other rivers found mentioned in the Vedas are identified with rivers on the west and north-west of this region of the five rivers. This shows that the Vedic culture extended far beyond the modern Punjab to the west. The gods of the Vedas were known in Asia Minor as is established by the mention of some of the important Vedic gods invoked as witnesses in a treaty between the Hettite king and the Mittani king, towards the close of the eleventh century before Christ.[1] Certain names closely resembling Sanskrit words and having some relation with them are found in Syria,[2] a non-Aryan region. There is a possibility that the region where the Vedic culture prevailed in those early days had its western boundary far more to the west than the boundary which has been fixed by scholars.

The great Persian Empire is reported to have comprised a kingdom called the Hindu (written in the Cuneiform inscriptions of the Persian Emperors as Hidu, since the sound is not written in that script before another consonant). Herodotus speaks of Hidu as one of the most extensive, most populous and most wealthy provinces of the Persian Empire. After conquering Persia, Alexander is reported to have reached the banks of the Indus River. He could not proceed further. Did he come *within* India or only on the India border on the eastern parts of the Persian Empire? When the successor of Alexander[3] and the Magadha Emperor Chandragupta Mourya came into conflict with each other, the former was defeated and he had to cede the eastern parts of his Empire to the latter. Did Chandragupta demand the annexation of any foreign territory to his Empire or did he ask for only such portions of the Empire which truly belonged to India, but which had come under foreign domination?

Some of these problems arise in my mind when I study the fourth canto of KALIDASA's *Raghuvaṁśa* where the March of Victory undertaken by Raghu is described. Raghu started from his Capital city of Saketa.[4] He proceeded eastward and reached the mouth of the Ganges, and turned southward. He did not go to the north east. The question arises why Raghu did not go further to the east, to eastern Kamboja. It cannot be that KALIDASA did not know the country; nor can it be that the place was not in contact with India. Inscriptions in Kamboja (east) show great affinity to the poetry of KALIDASA.[5] It is rather surprising that the regions where KALIDASA's influence had been felt, were ignored by KALIDASA himself.

Here one point is of great importance. KALIDASA was not simply describing the regions known to him. He knew China and yet Raghu was not sent there during his expeditions. He did not even go to the regions immediately to the east of India that had been the seat of the development of Indian culture for many centuries, as is evidenced by the archaeological finds in the region.[6] The fact may be that the spread of Indian culture to those regions must be long after the time of

KALIDASA. This has an important bearing on the problem of the date of KALIDASA. If KALIDASA had known those regions as coming within the cultural zone of India, I would have expected Raghu to go to the north-east and then come to the south. Raghu marches along the borderland of the cultural zone of India. KALIDASA says nothing about the conquest of the interior kingdoms within India like the kingdom of Mathura,[7] the Avanti Kingdom, [8] and the Anupa Kingdom,[9] that have been mentioned during the wedding of Indumati.[10] But he speaks about the Vangas[11] Kalingas,[12] Pandyas,[13] Kerala[14] and Aparanta.[15] Although the regions on the eastern side of India are ignored, KALIDASA sends Raghu to conquer Persia on the west and the region of the Hunas to the north of it. The western part of the Himalayan region is also included within the orbit of this expedition.

Raghu could have crossed over to Persia from Aparanta along the sea-route. KALIDASA must have known of ocean going vessels in the Arabian sea, and that is why he suggested such a possible course, which Raghu did not take. Raghu followed the land route;[16] he must have gone to Sindh and then marched to the west to Persia. MALLINATHA says that Raghu did not take the sea route because that was what is prohibited (perhaps for reason of orthodoxy).[17] But other commentators are more rational and convincing. They say that there is great difficulty and danger in transporting an army with elephants across the sea and so he took the land route, which is safer though longer and more circuitous.[18] MALLINATHA is not always a safe guide in such matters. He says that Aparanta is an island in the ocean.[19] We all know that it is the part of the west coast of India north of Kerala. The simile also is in accord with the interpretation of the more trustworthy commentators. Raghu took the land route to reach Persia, like a person who, by practising self-discipline, gets at the enemies (to destroy them) that are the objects of the sense organs.[20] *Tattvajñāna* (realisation of the ultimate Truth) is a longer course to get at the worldly enemies of man in the form of the various objects of sense enjoyment, in comparison with the process of physical mortifications; but it is safer. If one takes to physical mortifications to conquer his sense cravings, that may lead to dangers. Thus it must be the question of danger and not orthodoxy which persuaded Raghu to take the land route.

Although not quite relevent to the point at hand, here is another important point in this context relating to the date of KALIDASA. And the date of KALIDASA has some close relation to the extent of India according to him. *Tattvajñāna* (realisation of the Truth) is the end in itself, being of the nature of final beatitude according to *Advaita*.[21] It is the step for the final goal according to *Nyāya*[22] and *Vaiseṣika*[23] and also *Sāṅkhya.*[24] 'Control of sense craving is the earlier stage in the attainment of the knowledge of Truth.[25] But KALIDASA mentions this latter as the goal, and the realisation of truth as a step towards it. To KALIDASA, a good life in the world without being entangled in in worldliness, that is, with the sense cravings under complete control, is the ideal; and *Mokṣa* (final release) does not seem to have had any place in his philosophy. The goal reached by Raghu,[26] the cessation of re-birth prayed for at the end of the *Śākuntala*[27] and the advise given to Aja by Vasistha[28] through his disciple, must be interpreted in the light of this explicit statement of his philosophy. Anyway, can self-control be declared as the goal and the realisation of Truth as the step, if KALIDASA lived at a late date like the period of the Gupta ascendency? I consider this as supporting my view that KAILDASA lived in the time of Agnimitra. I shall have to take up this latter point presently in relation to the extent of India as presented by KALIDASA.

Pārasīka is not the whole of latter-day Persia. Pars is a small country to the south of the later Persia. From Sindh, Raghu must have marched to that southern region, the Province of Pars.[29] From there he went to the north to the country of the Huns.[30] It is here that Raghu took rest on the banks of the river Sindhu.[31] This Sindhu cannot be the Indus rver. The late S. P. Pandit has been able to trace a reading for Sindhu as Vankshu, which is identified with the Oxus.[32] On the Sindhu regions there were saffron plants growing.[33] Saffron is called *Kāśmīra* in Sanskrit. But that does not mean that saffron grew only in the political unit now known to us as Kashmir. There is a reference to Sindhu as the region where the son of Agnimitra, named Vasumitra, inflicted a crushing defeat on the Yavanas, in the *Mālavikāgnimitra.*[34] That Sindhu is taken by scholars as a river nearer the mainland of India than the Indus. But I see no reason why the Sindhu of the *Raghuvaṁśa* and the Sindhu of the *Mālavikāgnimitra* shall not be the same. The conquests of Pushyamitra as preliminary to his Horse-Sacrifice can be identical with the conquests of Raghu in extent, and this is the more reasonable line of investigation.[35]

Raghu did not go to Syria; he did not go to Asia Minor. There was not even a suggestion of Egypt. And all these countries were well-known in Sanskrit literature. The reason must be that such countries fell outside of the cultural zone of India. When I was dealing with Raghu's March of Victory (*Digvijaya*) in an earlier lecture, I had said that he did not undertake an expedition of wanton conquests of foreign countries. He was neither Darius nor Alexander. He was a *Dharmavijayin* (one who conquers to establish *Dharma* through the methods of *Dharma*). If KALIDASA had sent Raghu beyond what he considered

India, Raghu becomes an aggressor, an adventurer taking delight in conquests and plunder and booty. We must accept that KALIDASA was marking the boundaries of what he knew to be India in his time.

Chandragupta Mourya is known to have defeated the successor of Alexander,[36] and the latter ceded the eastern part of his domain to the former. Why did Chandragupta remain content with this eastern portion? Why did he not think of getting the whole of the Greek Empire of Persia under his control? I do not accept it as a case similar to what happened in the case of Alexander. It is said that Alexander could easily have marched further and overrun India with the same ease with which he brought the whole of Persia under his rule; but the army became impatient and were eager to return home after many years of hard life abroad. It is rather surprising that such a wise course of action dawned in the minds of the soldiers only when they reached the Indian border and not within Persia, and it is equally surprising that even if the army had been pressing such demands on their leader for some time past, he showed such a consideration to their demands only at that stage. There must be some other reason, and that is that Alexander came across a new situation and *he simply could not press forward any further.*

And this is not the reason why Chandragupta did not ask for more territory. Chandragupta did not want one inch beyond the borders of the true India, the zone of Indian culture. He was a *Dharmavijayin.* The portion ceded to Chandragupta fell within that zone. Historians speak of the successor of Alexander having presented Chandragupta with his daughter for a marriage alliance (she married Chandragupta's son Bindusara and was the mother of the Mouryan Emperor Asoka). Along with this princess, rich presents in the form of gold and elephants were also sent to Chandragupta. Was it a present or was it a symbol of subordination to Chandragupta? The custom in those days was for the *subordinate* rulers to offer the hands of their daughters for a marriage alliance to their emperors, and also to send such rich presents to them. Further there is the great Greek historian Megasthenese, who is spoken of as holding the exalted position of "Greek Ambassador" in the Court of Chandragupta at Pataliputra. Did such an exchange of ambassadors between rulers of equal status exist in those days? This exchange of diplomatic representatives with their "Protocol" came into existence in the western countries during very recent times. What we find in the ancient literature of India is that the feudatory rulers sent their representatives to the Court of the Emperor with some customary tribute. This custom continued even in the Moghul days in India. And was there any "exchange" of ambassadors between Chandragupta and the Greek rulers of Persia? We hear nothing of an Ambassador of Chandragupta sent to the west.

All these facts indicate that India of those days, as known to and recognised by KALIDASA, extended far more to the west than the present day Indian border. KALIDASA must have known of this re-establishment of the politica lpower of India over the *whole* of the western India by Chandragupta. In the fourth canto of the *Raghuvaṁśa* where the March of Victory (*Digvijaya*) undertaken by Raghu is described, there is seen some reflection of the memory of the glorious day of Chandragupta in India retained even in the day of KALIDASA. This also supports a date for KALIDASA not far removed from those incidents (the incidents relate to about 300 B. C.). A date round about 175 to 150 B. C. seems to be a safe and reasonable one for KALIDASA. When later Sakas and Hunas migrated to India and were absorbed into the Indian nation very easily, they did not come as foreigners, as conquerors. They really migrated from within the zones of Indian culture to other parts of India. They adopted Indian names, accepted Indian religion and became Indians also. These western borderlands of India, being within the zones of Indian culture, later came under the political and religious power of peoples from regions outside of the zones of Indian culture. But all such foreigners were stopped at that line, and India continued the home of Indian culture. We, living nearly two thousand years later, can little realise what a great influence this king among poets could have exerted on the nation, by rousing their spirit of patriotism to safeguard the territory as the home of their culture, to maintain their culture within that region. India continued to remain the home of that ancient culture because the rulers in India refused to go one step beyond their legitimate territory, and poets like KALIDASA roused the spirit of the nation to maintain the integrity of their territory and the purity of their culture. That is why I say that poets in India did not write poetry that remained a curiosity to the few people; they wrote poetry which influenced the life of the people, that inspired the nobility of their character to protect their heritage. If the poets did not guide, if the rulers had been aggressors and adventurers addicted to wanton conquests and plunder, India would long ago have followed the foot-steps of other countries.

The extent of India as known to KALIDASA and recognised by him is also found reflected in the *Kumārasambhava*. The *Kumārasambhava* easily lends itself to an interpretation as a political allegory, as a sequel to what has been said in the fourth canto of the *Raghuvaṁśa*. I have already published an article on this subject in a book called the *Bhāratakaumudi*.[37] I do not want to repeat the points; I simply give a brief outline of the theory that I have presented there. In the *Raghuvaṁśa*, KALIDASA described India as extending to the western regions far beyond the borders of latter day India. But after the days of the Mouryan Hero Chandragupta, many events took place in the country. The Mouryan dynasty came to the end of its ruling powers and a new dynasty, founded by Pushyamitra, ruled over Magadha. Sanskrit literature preserved the memory of Chandragupta[38] and of Pushyamitra,[39] while others famous in history like Asoka, were completely forgotten, and in the whole range of Sanskrit literature there is only a casual mention of that name in the list of kings between Chandragupta and Pushyamitra.[40]

During this interval, the western portion of the cultural zone of India had gone out of it. Pushyamitra's grandson, Vasumitra, the son of Agnimitra, might have inflicted a defeat on the Yavanas on the Banks of the Sindhu;[41] but KALIDASA must have known of the fact that those portions, which previously formed a part of India and which he recognised as such, did not actually come within that area during his time. India became confined to the great Himalayan range on the North.

The vast India, the consort of the great God became an object of derision at the hands of the rulers of India (India's father) and India lost her life. It was reborn as the daugther of the Himalayas, confined to the hold of that mountain range,[42] losing the portions farther to the west. This India was again united with the great God, and there was a revival of the glories of India, confined to this narrower range. This in short, is the allegory found in the epic.

The actual India where the culture of India remained firm and undiminished, as known to KALIDASA, was smaller than the India which is the real India and which he described in the *Raghuvaṁśa*. In the *Raghuvaṁśa* we see India as KALIDASA knew it to have been in ancient days and as he wanted it to be; in the *Kumārasambhava* we find the same India, a smaller India, with her culture revived known as the actual India to KALIDASA. It is that smaller India that remained India for a long time, for many centuries. KALIDASA sings of these two Indias.

I have not introduced the points dealt with in this lecture, which is the last of the series, as what relate to political problems. My subject is a cultural study of KALIDASA. I dealt with various points like kings and common people, heaven and earth, renunciation and final release, nature and art, and beauty. They all have reference to our India. KALIDASA does not use the word India, and he could not have done so, in so far as the name is quite a recent one. Nor does he use the term *Bhārata*, which is ancient. He speaks only of the whole of the Earth. To him the whole world is what was dominated by the culture which he was trying to uphold. Where there is no such culture, there is no importance either, as a habitation of civilized man. And he wanted that culture to dominate the whole world.

When culture decayed there has been a dimunition of the area dominated by that culture. It has been like an amputation of the decayed parts, so that what remains of the body may be preserved free from the disease. There has been a further amputation in recent times, and there are signs of the disease of disruption entering the whole body. It is only culture that can preserve the body free from the disease and from the danger. I have added this last chapter as a separate heading for the lectures to show the relation between integrity of the nation and culture, which is a legitimate point in a treatment of KALIDASA from the cultural point of view.

The Vedas, the *Mahābhārata*, the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the works of KALIDASA have a value for humanity; they are not meant for any particular country or nation or religion or race or community. KALIDASA makes no mention of creeds and sects. Nor is there any such sectarian bias in the Vedas and in the *Mahābhārata* and the *Rāmāyaṇa*. They primarily belonged to India, the land of culture, and they are meant for humanity, that can be supported and preserved only by culture.

Historians regard the Vedas as the basic text of a particular religion and they regard the *Mahābhārata* and the *Rāmāyaṇa* as records of an attempt for a *revival* of that religion after it was dominated by Buddhism for some time. KALIDASA is also regarded as an important figure in the "revivalism" of that religion dominated by a particular class among the nation.

Time has come when there must be a new approach to the problem of estimating the values of our ancient literatures. First of all we must recognise that there are certain values for the ancient literatures, and then we must correctly estimate such values. I have prepared these lectures *only to indicate* that there are certain values attached to ancient Indian literature and that there is scope for a new approach to the problems. I wanted also to emphasise the importance of our ancient literature for solving some of the grave problems that we are facing now. I conclude this course with the passage that closes the *Śākuntala*, which is perhaps the last line written by the great poet:

sarasvatī śrutimahati mahīyatām

May culture, which is superior to scripture, remain dominent among the nation.

NOTES

[K=*Kumārasambhava*; M=*Mālavikāgnimitra*; MD=*MeghaDūta*
R=*Raghuvaṁśa*; S=*Śākuntala*; V=*Vikramorvaśīya*]

INTRODUCTORY

(Pp. 1 to 23)

1 Translated in 1789

2 Translated by Georg Forster in 1791

3 Published in the Everyman's Series in two volumes.

4 Under verse 1 he mentions the *Mahābhārata* and the *Rāmāyaṇa* and under verse 6 he mentions Kalidasa, as the best in literature.

5 R I—9

6 There is a commentary on this latter portion by Sitarama Kavi; it is likely that he himself wrote the text also for this portion. Mallinatha who has written commentaries on the poems of Kalidasa does not comment on this portion.

7 MD 1—24

8 MD 1—30 to 37

9 See Introduction to the *Ślokavārtika* with the commentary of Umveka in the Madras University Sanskrit Series.

10 See Inscriptions of Samudragupta.

11 There is clear evidence that the element *Vikrama* in this Title is relevent and is not casually introduced for any other purpose.

12 R I—12

13 There lives in eminence Ravikirti on whose poem is found a place of rest by the poetic fame of Kalidasa and Bharavi, in the Aihole Inscriptions of 634 A.D.

14 There is no possibility of what is prayed for, namely, freedom from national calamities not being in abundance, when Agnimitra is the protector.

15 MD I—24

16 See Kshirasvamin's commentary on the *Amarakośa* under the synonyms of "Emperor"–II–8–2. Agnimitra is also mentioned as a poet with a synonym *Jvalanamitra* (*Jalaṇamitta*) elsewhere.

17 R Canto IV

18 K

19 In S. the *Vidūṣaka* says in the biginning of Act II that he was getting tired of eating meat roasted on the spear-head. The reference must be to his own food and not to the king's food as he is concerned with his own pleasures. In Act III of V. the *Vidūṣaka* says: "I too, when I do not get the meat of the female deer well-prepared, long for it and find solace," There is an alternative reading "sweet-meat" for "meat of female deer". If Kalidasa had written "sweat-meat", it is impossible that some one at a later date should change it into "meat of deer". If Kalidasa had written "meat of the deer" I can well understand how some one at a later date made the emendation, through sentimental objections.

20 R VI—29 and concluding benedictory verse in V.

21 R I—8 and beginning of Canto V.

22 See R. VI-62.

23 R. VI—49, where Kaliya is a victim instead of being a frightful Dragon.

24 MD I—1 and 12; II—37.

25 MD I—48

26 MD I—15

27 R. VI—49 and K. III—13

28 R. VI—49

29 R IV—37

30 VI—57

31 IV—45

32 IV—34

33 VI—64

34 IV—48

35 IV—61

36 IV—68

37 IV—67

38 IV—76

39 IV—72

40 IV—76 to 78

41 VI—29

42 VI—30

43 I—1: M. First Benedictory verse.

44 S. First Benedictory verse.

KINGS

(Pp. 24 to 46)

1 He has written the three dramas; *Ratnāvali*, *Priyadarśikā* and *Nāgānanda*.

2 See the story of Dhavaka in *Kāvyaprakāśa* I—2

3 Under verse 1

4 R. I—13 to 30

5 I—19

6 I—15

7 S. Below I—21

8 S. Prologue to Act IV

9 R I—16

10 18

11 19

12 20

13 22

14 23

15 28

16 S. V—6

17 S. Act II

18 R V—31

19 I-33

20 I—34

21 I—37

22 *Ibid.*

23 R I—36

24 38

25 39

26 40

27 41

28 42 I have my own doubts how the favourable nature of the wind, that is blowing in the same direction in which they were also travelling, can be a cause of the dust kicked up by the horses, not being able to touch their head. If it is a description of the speed of the chariot, then it should have been like this: though the wind, being favourable, wafted the dust in the same direction, the dust could not touch their head. But the point relates to the wind that was favourable.

29 R I—43

30 44

31 R I—45

32 47 I cannot accept Mallinatha's interpretation of the word *priyadarśana* as "one pleasing to look at". There are many passages, where I cannot accept Mallinatha's interpretation.

33 R I—49 to 53

34 75,76 and 79; verses 77 and 78 are definitely interpolations; verse 81 later contradicts the statement in verse 77.

35 R I 80 and 81

36 94

37 54

38 *Ibid.*

39 R II—4 This note is wrongly marked 33 on P. 34 last line. Read "His" in the place of "This" in the beginning of the sentence.

40 R I—3

41 26 to 29

42 30

43 31

44 35 to 38

45 39

46 45

47 47

48 48

49 49 I cannot accept Mallinatha's interpretation of the word *ekadhenoḥ* as "having a single cow".

50 R I—55

51 61

52 63 and 65

53 R I 73
54 IV—43
55 III—29 and 30
56 I—15
57 I—19
58 III—25
59 III—29
60 III—29 to 34
61 V—24
62 IV—35
63 IV—37
64 IV—43
65 IV—86
66 V—1
67 2
68 17
69 24
70 *Taittirīyopaniṣad* II — 11 Having brought wealth to the Teacher which would please him, see that the family line does not break down (= you much marry and have children).
71 R V—21
72 25
73 26
74 29
75 30
76 31
77 37
78 38
79 39
80 42 to 49
81 50
82 51
83 52 and 53
84 54 and 55
85 56 to 58
86 R V 60
87 41
88 61
89 64 and 65
90 66 to 74
91 VI—1
92 2
93 3
94 5 In this verse, the meaning given by the commentators is not acceptable. If Mallinatha's meaning is that it is the lustre from Aja that flashed on the row of kings, I can accept the interpretation. He is not quite clear on the point.
95 R VI—10
96 20
97 70
98 83 and 84
99 VII—5 to 15
100 19 to 28
101 34 to 60
102 61 and 62
103 VIII—1 and 2
104 10
105 12 to 14
106 15 to 22
107 R VIII—24
108 32 to 37
109 44 to 69
110 79 to 82
111 75
112 28
113 92
114 94
115 95
116 Acts I to IV and Act VII
117 Act VI

THE COMMON PEOPLE AND WOMEN

(Pp. 47 to 64)

1 According to the *Prābhākara* School of the *Mīmāṁsā* system of philosophy, it is the quality of a single observation that produces the knowledge of a universal relation, and not the number of repeated observations of concomitances between two facts. (This note relates to P. 52, Ll. 26 and 27)

2 R I—44

3 I—45

4 In R.

5 Girls wave fans of the tail of *Camara*-deer before the kings when they are seated on their throne.

6 R III—16

7 V—31

8 in Act V

9 R Canto IV

10 R IV—42

11 V—41

12 K I—2 to 17

13 I—10

14 I—6

15 I—12 and 17

16 I—9 and 22

17 Ganadasa who trained the heroine in dancing and Haradatta who gave lessons to a younger queen of the hero, named Iravati.

18 R III—25

19 III—26

20 III—14 to 17, and 23 and 24

21 K I—29 to 49

22 S VII—17

23 R I—50 I do not accept Mallinatha's interpretation relating the word *Ṛṣipatnīnām* (of the wives of the sages) with *Apatyaiḥ* (childrean); I relate it to the word *Uṭajadvārarodhibhiḥ* (the entrance of the hermitage).

24 R I—51

25 IV—20

26 I—45; see also Note 31 above in Chapter on Kings and the comment on it in the paragraph that follows.

27 R IV—54

28 IV—61

29 IV—68

30 In Act IV where the heroine departs from the forest hermitage where she grew up, to the palace of her newly wedded husband, the two companions say. "Friend, if by chance that king is noticed to be a little hesitant to recognise you, then show him this ring which is marked with his own name". It is the loss of the ring and the refusal of

the king to accept the heroine and its consequences that form the chief items in the later plot of the drama.

31 In Can to VII

32 In Can toVII

33 Canto VI

34 I have serious doubts about the authenticity of this description as coming from the pen of Kalidasa, and I ignore it.

35 K VII—56; R VII—5

36 VII—57; VII—6

37 VII—58; VII—7

38 VII—59; VII—8

39 VII—60; VII—9 Read 39 instead of 3 at the end of the 2nd verse from bottom)

40 VII—61; VII—10

41 VII—62; VII—11

42 VII—63; VII—12 Verse 63 in K. describes Siva and is not connected with the behavior of the women. The verses in R have been slightly adapted to the context. And what is given above is the K. version.

43 K VII—66: R VII—14

44 MD. I—8

45 MD I—16

46 I—24

47 *Ibid.*

48 M I—25

49 I—26

50 Namely, the vicinity of the city of Vidisa. After passing the city of Ujjayini, Kalidasa's interest is in Siva and his consort and his son Skanda, and not in the places.

51 MD I—30 to 41

52 I—27

53 *Ibid.*

54 MD- I—28

55 I—29

56 I—31

57 I—32

58 I—38

59 I—33

60 I—35

61 1—37

62 I—40

63 I—41

64 I—42 to 44

IDEAL OF BEAUTY

(Pp. 65 to 81)

1 I shall make a fifth Veda on the *Nātya* I—15

2 *Nat.* I—2 to 5

3 I—16

4 *Nāṭ* I—24 and 25

5 I—64 to 66

6 I—105 to 120

7 I—108

8 In the world of the creator, there are recognised only six *Rasas* or tastes (sweet, salt, hot, astringent sour and bitter) while in the world of poets there are nine *Rasas* or emotions (love, heroism, remorse, wonder, derision, terror, disgust, wrath aud tranquillity) Here there is a play on the word *Rasa* to bring about the superiority of the words of the poets over the world of the creator.

9 *Kāvyaprakāśa* I—1

10 His work is called *Kāvyādarśa*

11 *Kāvyādarśa* I—3

12 *Dhvanyāloka* 1-4, 6 etc.

13 Parvati is the daughter of the mountain Himalayas; she became the consort of the great God Siva. Paramesvara means "the Supreme Lord," and is generally applied to Siva.

14 *Ardha* is half and *Nārī* is woman; Siva and Parvati share a single body, half and half, and they together form the Godhead,

15 R. I. 4

16 Kalidasa enumerates 16 qualities in the kings of this Dynasty in R. I—5 to 8

17 R. I—9

18 K. I—3

19 S. I—17

20 V. II—3

21 I—8

22 MD II—19

23 *Ibld.*

24 K I—31

25 I—32

26 I—33 to 48

27 I—49

28 S. II—10

29 II—9

30 In the description of the beauty of Parvati; see Notes 24, 25 and 27 above (This Note is by mistake marked 39 on P. 75. L. 30.

31 R VI—11

32 As expressed by Mammata in his *Kāvyaprakāśa*; see Note 9 above.

33 V. Prologue to Act III

34 Although Bharata says that his dramatic art contains everything that is found in the world, still he takes the art as superior to the facts of the world in so far as what are prohibited in the Vedas where there is the prescription of what is good in the world, are also welcomed in his art as acceptable and good for art.

35 *Dhvanyāloka* I—6 to 12

36 ,, under I—1

37 M., in the Prologue to the Act, verse 4.

38 Anandavardhana and especially his commentator Abhinavagupta. who has commented on Bharata, gave a religious touch to the theory of aesthetic enjoyment; but Kalidasa is more concerned with

the happineso of man in life, the happiness transcending the normal experiences in the world. The commentary on the *Sūtra* defining *Rasa* (Emotion) in the fifth Chapter of Bharata by Abhinavagupta may be consulted in this conuection.

39 M. *Bharatavākya* at the end.

40 The queen rebukes the king with the words, "If Your Majesty had the same skill in Diplomacy in the affairs of the kingdom also, it would have been excellent" (Act I-towards the close). The queen was afraid that such a marriage would stand in the way of the marriage of the nature of a political alliance with the sister of the prince of Vidarbha. The king had not thought of his aspect.

41 Therefore references to the first queen as *Caṇḍī* (wrathful) and to the heroine as rival, is out of place.

42 The words of the stage manager's associate called the *Pāripārśvika*,

43 *Bharatavākya* at the end, (This is by mistake marked 45 on P. 79 L. 18.

44 R, VI—29

45 *Bharavakāya* at the end.

ART

(Pp. 82 to 103)

1 R I—9

2 K VIII—91 (This refers to P 83. LL. 12—14)

3 K II. Brahma occuppies a very high position in the Pantheon of Kalidasa, not found in later Mythological literature. At the time of the birth of Shri Rama and of Shri Krishna, it is Vishnu that takes up the position of being the highest God, in later Mythology.

4 K. II—57 to 61

5 II 51 and 52

6 K II 61

7 R VI—2

8 VII—15

9 MD I—42 to 45 (This is by mistake marked 8 on P. 85. L. 16)

10 Note especially R. II—64

11 R VIII—29

12 IX—80

13 I—5

14 Many scholars have stated that the description of the last king is only to bring out the contrast between the great

kings and the kings of the decadent stage of the Dynasty. But there is no hint in the text itself to justify such an explanation.

15 Thus Dasaratha is described as a great hero in the beginning; but later when he met Parasu Rama he was terror-stricken (R. XI—69). Then, after describing him as being incapable of detraction from the path of virtue by hunting and by women (R. IX-7), later he is spoken of as having killed an elephant during a hunt prohibited for kings, being blinded by interest in it (R. IX—74) and as having deprived his eldest son Shri Rama of his legitimate throne and as having sent him into exile, to please his favourite queen (R. XII—4 to 6).

16 Hunting, which is the real theme in the Canto, is to follow the Spring season, and this is the only relevency for the description of the season in the context

17 K. III—24 to 34 (This refers to P. 88. LL. 10—14)

18 R XIII—2

19 XIII—3

20 XIII—4

21 XIII—5

22 XIII—6

23 XIII—7

24 XIII—8

25 R XIII—9

26 XIII—10

27 XIII—11

28 XIII—12

29 XIII—13

30 R XIII—14 And this again is a description of the Milky ocean found in the Mythologies and not of the ocean which they were crossing from Lanka to India. Further, can any one imagine whirlpools in the middle of the ocean in that particular context, where clouds rotate this way and that way like a churning rod? A cloud can be like a mountain; there are whirl-pools and the Milky ocean was churned with a mountain as churning rod. But they all do not come together.

31 R XIII—15. *Tamāla* is a kind of tree that has thick foliage making the whole place dark.

32 *Cāmaras* are small fibery decorations, resembling the fans in shape and colour, which fans are waved before kings sitting on the throne.

33 R XIII—54 to 58

34 Cantos I and II

35 Canto III

36 Canto IV

37 Canto V

38 Contos VI and VII

39 R Canto VIII (This refers to P. 91. LL 35 and 36)

40 Cantos IX to XV

41 Canto IX

42 Canto XVI

43 Canto XVII

44 Canto XVIII

45 Canto XIX (This refers to P. 92 L. 4)

46 Each Canto or group of Cantos forms an independent unit in this latter part, and they are not united to each other as in the first 8 Cantos where the description of the son is well on the way before the father retires from the scene.

47 For examqle, when the family teacher of Dilipa, Vasishtha, went into a transe to find out the supernatural cause for the absence of a son born to him, with his eyes closed, he is compared to a lake where the fish are sleeping, and such a lake is appropriate to a hermitage (R. I—73). Again, when the lion was sitting on the back of the cow, which was being tended by the king in the forest, he is compared to a *Lodhra* tree on a hill, very appropriate to a mountain scenery (R. II—29). I can cite many such examples.

48 It is true that in the final Canto of R. there is a picture of the voluptuous king; but that is not a picture that can be given a place in a decent gallery of Kalidasa.

49 S. V—3

50 V. III—1

51 The hero marries the heroine between the events of Act III and Act IV, and there is no occasion for any more love affair.

52 The king abandons the heroine when she went to his house, sinc he could not recollect the events that took place in the hermitage, and later when he recollects them, he is full of grief at his conduct, and this is the theme in Act VI.

53 Love or Heroism.

54 In V.

55 In S.

56 In M.

57 That is my personal experience too, having started the study of sanskrit with the *Raghuvaṁśa* at the age of five, and even now, when I am past 60, I find enough in Kalidasa to study, which can occuppy my whole time, and more.

58 A comparison of the vocabulary of Kalidasa with the standard lexicon of Amara will prove the point.

59 What is termed the *Yaugika* meaning.

60 Be pleased to enjoy your life in the Malaya regions where the arecanut trees have betal creepers winding round them, where the sandal trees are embraced by the cardomom creepers, where the whole area is covered with the *Tamāla* trees (R. VI—64). Here the alliteration on the sound *L* and the absence of hard sounds and conjunct consonants difficult to pronounce, may be noted.

61 Holding the articles for an honoured welcome in an earthen vessel, because he had given away all his golden ones, he with conduct of inestimable worth, shining with his glory, devoted to honouring his guests, rose up on the arrival of the guest who was shining with his Vedic learning. V–2 (This refers to the verse on P. 98 LL. 13 and 14.)

62 R. I—48. He possessing an unapproachable (*duṣprāpa*) glory reached (*prāpat*) the hermitage (*āśramam*) with his horses tired (*śrānta-vāhanaḥ*) in the evening (*sāyam*): the hermitage of the great Sage (*Maharṣeḥ*) endowed with self–discipline (*saṁyaminaḥ*) in the company of his queen (*mahiṣīsakhaḥ*). Here the alliteration may not be injurious to the meaning in all the cases; yet one feels some effort that interferes with the natural beauty of the art of poetry. The protion *saṁyaminaḥ*, which alliterates with *sāyam* is of no purpose at all, so far as the meaning is concerned. (This refers to the verse on P. 98 LL. 23 and 24.)

63 To him, the protector (*goptre*) for whom wise policy is the eye (*nayacakṣuse*), who deserves honour (*arhate*), and who was accompanied by his queen (*sabhāryāya*), the sages (*munayaḥ*) who were worthy members of the assembly, (*sabhyāḥ*) with their sense-organs completely under control (*guptatamendriyaḥ*) gave an honoured reception (*arhaṇām*). Here also there are adjectives that have no special purpose other than that of alliteration. (This refers to the verse on P. 98 LL. 29 and 30.)

64 See Magha's *śiśupālavadha*, Cantos IV to XI

65 The first 54 verses; after that there is an exhibition of various metres in this Canto.

66 R. IX—24 to 47

67 I—1

68 K. II—27

69 R. II-2. *Śruti* is the original scriptural text for Moral Law and *Smṛti* is the later text

presenting the meanings and prescriptions of such original scriptural texts.

70 R. I—36 This is when they go to the hermitage of the family teacher; this is more what he knew from texts than what he could see in his imagination.

71 M. Act III: the first speech of the heroine when she enters suggests this event.

72 S. I—14

73 V. III—9

74 There is a profusion of this conventional idea in the works of Kalidasa.

75 R. V—17

76 S Act III, under verse 21 and Act IV, under verse 15

77 R. I—2

78 I—3

79 I—4

80 He is the leader of the troupe and the manager of the stage.

81 R I—10

82 V I—2 (in the Prologue)

83 S Prologue

NATURE

(Pp. 104 to 123)

1 Especially the Ode on Mother Earth (XII—1). It is very likely that Europe received the inspiration about the beauty of Nature from the Eastern Literatures.

2 Ram. III—16

3 Mah—Bhar. III—145 ff.

4 R. I—36 to 47

5 49 to 53

6 II—7 to 13

7 6

8 14

9 15 and 17

10 25 to 29

11 27

12 IV. 14 to 24

13 R Canto IV, from verse 26.

14 33

15 34

16 35

17 36 and 37

18 42

19 44

20 45

21 47 (the Note refers to P. 109 L. 27 to 29).

22 48

23 50

24 *Ibid.*

25 R. IV—55

26 56

27 57

28 R. IV. 65

29 67 (The note is wrongly numbered 24 on P. 110).

30 R. IV—71

31 72

32 73

33 74

34 75

35 76

36 79

37 V—43 to 50

38 VI—29

39 34 and 35

40 43

41 48 (the real confluence of Jumna with Ganges is far lower down at Allahabad; yet this confluence appears to be higher up than Muttra, near Delhi).

42 R. VI—50

43 51

44 56

45 57

46 63

47 64

48 67

49 VIII—39

50 S. and V.

51 M

52 S. Act IV where the heroine takes leave of the hermitage, and in Act V where the heroine narrates some events in the hermitage to remind the hero of their former union.

53 S. I—16

54 Act I.

55 *Ibid.*

56 *Ibid.*

57 *Ibid.*

58 S. Act V.

59 IV—5

60 R. II—12

61 S. IV—5

62 9

63 10

64 11

65 Under IV—11

66 IV—12 and above this verse.

67 This creeper played a very important role in the first Act when the heroine and the two companions were watering the trees and the plants in the hermitage grove.

68 This too is mentioned in the context in the first Act, very prominently.

69 This is the most pathetic passage in the whole drama; see how her distrust in a husband is indicated by asking the creeper to embrace her only with such of the branches that are loose and that are drooping down on her side, so that it would not have to loosen its hold on the tree.

70 S. IV—13

71 Perhaps this is the deer that is mentioned as having been chased by the hero to the gates of the hermitage in Act I.

72 S. IV—14

73 *Cakravāka* is a kind of bird living in tanks and other water abodes, and they make a wailing sound in evening times; it is the convention among poets that the pair of this bird separates at night and that they wail in the evening at the approaching separation.

74 R. IV—71 to 79

75 K. I—1 to 17

76 4

77 K. I—5

78 6

79 7

80 8

81 9

82 10

83 11

84 12

85 13

86 14

87 15

HEAVEN AND EARTH

(Pp. 124 to 140)

1 *Ṛgveda* IX—113—6 to 11 alredy noticed in my book on the Vedas.

2 In the *Ṛgveda*, Yama is a great God, the Founder of the Vedic Religion, the first to see the Path to Heaven and to cross over to that region, and to show that Path to men. He is the son of Vivasvat, the Sun. In later mythology, he continues as the son of Vivasvat, but becomes a terrible deity, the Lord of Hell. In the *Ṛgveda* there is no Hell; Yama rules over the Heaven. In the Iranian tradition, he is known as Yima, the first king on Earth to herald civilized life among men.

3 The description of the region with its location and with its divisions is rather obscure; so is it in the following verse also.

4 The exact difference between the various terms used is not very clear. I have only used different terms to indicate that in the original also there are terms related to one another and having more or less similar meanings.

5 The four goals are Virtue, Acquisition, Enjoyment and Beatitude. The note must come after the word *Mokṣa* and not after *Kāma*.

6 V. Under V—19

7 R. III—70

8 Ikshvaku is one of the greatest of the kings of the Solar Dynasty, who preceded Dilipa. The dynasty is known after his name also.

9 R. VIII—24

10 The point will be considered in greater detail presently. There is a reference to a nail in the form of grief, having split his heart, and he speaks of that grief as what even physicians cannot cure. There is also a reference to the body as having been affected by diseases, which he wanted to get rid of. The diseases mentioned here can be only the mental diseases like attachment, mentioned in the *Aṣṭāṅga-Hṛdaya* (First verse), which is the standard work on medicine. Aja was eager to leave off that body, because that was the only way in which he could rejoin his beloved and continue the same enjoyment in Heaven, which he had on earth in her company (R. VIII—93 and 94.) There is no hint that life on earth is a suffering.

11 R. VIII—92

12 93

13 94

14 95

15 I—8

16 R. I—75, 76, 79 and 81

17 See the episode of Raghu's fight against Indra as a boy in R. III—38 to 66

18 R. III—44

19 45

20 47

21 48

22 51

23 52

24 53

25 54

26 55

27 56

28 57

29 58

30 59

31 60

32 61

33 62, 63

34 64

35 65

36 The reference is to the story of the mountains having had wings at some ancient times and of Indra having cut down their wings with his weapon called *Vajra*, so that the mountains became fixed on the surface of the earth, instead of flying in the skies. The story is often alluded to in the Vedas.

37 R. VIII—79 and 80

38 S. Act I

39 *Ibid.*

40 S. II—15

41 S. VI—29

42 30

43 R. VIII—79 and 80

44 III—23

45 V—36

46 There was a slight change in her nature as a result of the curse, and yet she retained most of her celestial powers like the ability to conceal herself from being seen by others (V. Acts II and III). But she had lost her powers of discrimination, and for this reason, she entered the garden into which entry of women was prohibited. (V. Act IV).

47 V. Act I

48 Act II

49 II—16

50 Originally, Bharata had enumerated only eight *Rasas* or emotional states; tranquility and serenity (*Śānta*) is a nineth added at a later stage, to include the ideals of renunciation and beatitude in the scheme of the emotional values of art.

51 V. II—18

52 Act II

53 Act III, Prologue

54 S. Acts II and III

55 V. Act V

56 IV—34 (Marked as 76 on P. 37 L 34)

57 35

58 It is the Goddess Parvati, the daughter of the mountain and consort of Siva.

59 V. IV—36

60 37

61 Gauri is another name for Parvati, the consort of Siva.

62 Pratishthana was the Capital of the kings of the Lunar Dynasty, till it was shifted to Hastinapura, which was their Capital at the time of the *Mahābhārata* events.

63 V. Act IV

64 Act I

65 Act III, Prologue

66 Act V

RENUNCIATION RELEASE

(Pp. 141 to 164)

1 R. I—5 to 8

2 The word used is in the plural number; he is himself the son of Dilipa. The actual word is *Dilīpavaṁśajāḥ* (those born of the dynasty of Dilipa). The mention of a custom among those born in the dynasty of Dilipa is rather a puzzle, when the context is

about his son. Is it that Raghu the son of Dilipa, being the first in the dynasty, is spoken of as having set the standard for the future descendents of the dynasty? There was already a mention of the custom among the members of the dynasty of Ikshvaku. See Note 8 in the previous chapter relating to Heaven and earth.

3 R. VIII—10 and 11

4 24

5 Br. Up. 1—3—28

6 Bh. Gita. VIII—9 and 10

7 R. VI —22—20

8 Virtue, acquisition and enjoyment.

9 Virtue, acquisition and enjoyment are *Artha's* or goals in so far as an activity is needed to secure them, and an activity presupposes a purpose or goal also. When the fourth stage is added, it is also designated as an *Artha* or goal, through association, not because there is an activity with that fourth stage as the objective or goal.

10 R. III—70

11 Ch. Up. 8—1—6

12 R. VIII—87 to 89

13 93 to 94

14 95

15 In K. and in S.

16 Modern Review 1913 PP. 348 and 349 (see further citations from Laurence Binyon's translation of the *Śākuntala*, Introduction, as supplement to this Note).

17 S. I—20

18 Act I

19 III—21

20 Ancient law-givers of India recognise eight forms of legal marriage; *Gāndharva* form is one of them, in which there is only mutual consent of the parties, without any religious rites or preparatory ceremonies and formalities.

21 S. III—20

22 VI—16. We need not take the reproach of Gautami very seriously; she has a feeling of wounded pride in that though she is an elderly lady and the most important person in the hermitage in the absence of the Sage Kanva, she was not even informed of the events, to say nothing of being consulted.

23 This is not the author's view; it is only a possible view presented for refutation.

24 S. IV—13

25 Act IV, just above verse 4.

26 S. Close of Act VII

27 S. IV—4

28 V—16

29 IV—19. I take the word *Niveśya* to mean "Having conducted the wedding" as given by some commentators and not as meaning "Having placed (on the throne)" as given by the generality of commentators.

30 S. VII—34
31 Act I
32 I—23
33 Immediately under the verse above given.
34 S. Act IV
35 R. I—76
36 79
37 S. Act VII This refers to P. 156 L. 33
38 See Notes 35 and 36 above
39 S. above IV—18
40 IV—18
41 Act IV
42 IV—6
43 IV—1 (Prologue)
44 Renunciation
45 K. I—52
46 Canto I
47 Canto II
48 Canto III
49 Canto V
50 Canto VI
51 Canto VII
52 Canto VII. Even after a hundred years of enjoyment, Siva remained not satisfied with physical pleasures.
53 K. I—1
54 18
55 21
56 50
57 51
58 53
59 Siva has eight forms, namely the five Elements, the Sun and the Moon and the Self. Fire is one of the five Elements.
60 K. I—57
61 52
62 59
63 The whole situation and its contrast to the spirit of penance cannot escape our attention.
64 K. I—57 *Kenāpi kāmena tapaś cacāra*
65 S. Act II
66 See note 64 above
67 K. III—72
68 74
69 See Note 62 above
70 K. III — 74 (*Antardadhe bhūtapatiḥ sabhūtaḥ*)
71 K. VX—1
72 2
73 86
74 I—54 to 57
75 This is the traditional view of the penance undertaken by the two. See the familiar verse: *Parasparatapaḥsampatphalāyitaparasparau* (Between whom each became the fruit of the penance undertaken by the other).
76 K. Canto VII
77 Canto VIII
78 VIII—91

HARMONY

(Pp. 165 to 179)

1 Published by Motilal Banarsidass, 1952, P. 121

2 *Ṛgveda* X—XIV—2

3 *Ṛgveda* X—LXIII—7 (This refers to P. 165 L. 35, and the number 3 is put on P.166 L. 6 also by mistake)

4 *Atharvaveda* XIII—i—1

5 Ibid XII—i—45

6 *Ṛgveda* X—cxci—2 to 4

7 See passage cited an P. 1 above

8 R. I—94

9 S. Act V.

10 S. Act V: he had to consult his family teacher about the way in which he should treat Sakuntala, when she was abandoned by her escort and when he himself could not entertain her as his wife.

11 R. V—43 ff.

12 VII—35 ff.

13 M. Act I.

14 R. III—38 ff.

15 *Aṁśa-aṁśi-bhāva* and *Śeṣa-śeṣi-bhāva*

16 *Para*

17 S. Act VII

18 IV—20

19 *Dhvanyāloka* Ch. III

20 M. Opening benedictory verse

21 K. V—86

22 VII—55 ff.

23 VIII—91

24 VII—30 ff

25 Of K. VII—40 ff.

26 R. VI—29

OUR INDIA

(Pp. 180 to 187)

1 Found in the ruins at Boghazkoi.

2 For example Artamanya, Yazdata etc.

3 Soleukus Nikator

4 It must be at the confluence of Ganga and Sarayu, where it was that Aja went for his final Yogic emancipation from his body (R. VIII—95). Saketa is mentioned as the Capital only once (R. V—31)

5 Inscriptions of Cambodia.

6 As in Ankor and other places

7 R. VI—46 ff.

8 32 ff.

9 41 ff.

10 Canto VI.

11 IV—36

12 38 ff.

13 49

14 54

15 58

16 60

17 See Commentary of Mallinatha.

18 See Commentary of Arunagirinatha and Narayana (T. S. S.)

19 See Mallinatha's Commentary on R. IV—58

20 R. IV—60, second half.

21 *Tattavjñāna* (realisation of the Truth) is itself *Mokṣa* (beatitude)

22 Knowledge of the sixteen Categories leads to the goal.

23 Knowledge of the six Categories leads to the goal.

24 *Sāṅkhyakārikā* 1 and 2.

25 See the four-fold eligibility for the study of *Vedānta* in Sankara's commentary on the *Vedānta Sūtras*, among which come *Śama*, *Dama* etc. which are of the nature of such disciplines.

26 He reached the *Puruṣa* beyond darkeness (R. VIII–224)

27 Final Benedictory verse in S.

28 R. VIII—87 ff,

29 *Pārasīka* must be Pars which is only a part of the latter-day Persia.

30 R. IV—66, 68

31 67

32 Edition of the book in the Bombay Sanskrit Series

33 R. IV—67

34 M. Act V

35 I see no relation between the March of Victory undertaken by Raghu and the conquests of Samudragupta and Yasovarman, as some scholars have suggested.

36 Seleukus Nikator

37 Presented to Radha Kumud Mukerji of Lucknow University.

38 See the *Mudrārākṣasa*, some stories about the incidents prior to the main stories in *Kathā-Saritsāgara* etc.' Patanjali's *Mahābhāṣya* (I—i—68) ete.

39 See Patanjali's *Mahābhāṣya* (I-i-68, III-i-26 and ii-26)

40 In the *Purāṇas*

41 M. Act V

42 K. I—21

SUPPLEMENT TO NOTE 16 IN THE CHAPTER ON RENUNCIATION AND REREASE

......*motif* of the play is the progress from the earlier union of the first Act with its earthly unstable beauty and romance, to the higher union in the heavely hermitage* of eternal bliss described in the last Act. This drama was meant.........to elevate love from the sphere of physical beauty to the eternal heaven of moral beauty.

In the first Act the poet has not concealed the gross earthiness of the fall of Sakuntala; he has clearly shown, in the conduct of the hero and the heroine alike, how much desire contributed to that fall.

Our rebellious passions raise storms. In this drama Kalidasa has extinguished the volcanic fire of tumultuous passion by means of the tears of the penitent heart.

With masterly skill the poet here shows that what Durvasa's curse had brought about had its seeds in human nature.

Dushyanta is now consumed by remorse. This remorse is *tapasya.* So long as Sakuntala was not won by means of this repentence, there was no glory in winning her......One sudden gust of youthful impulse had in a moment given her up to Dyshyanta, but that was not the true, the full winning of her. The best means of winning is by devotion, by *tapasya.* What is easily gained is easily lost. Therefore, the poet has made the two lovers undergo a long and austere *tapasya* that they may gain each other truly eternally.

Thus has Kalidasa burnt away vice in the eternal fire of the sinner's heart; he has not tried to conceal it from the outside. When the curtain drops in the last Act, we feel that all the evil has been destroyed as on a funeral pyre, and the peace born of a perfect and satisfactory fruition reigns in our hearts......He has made the physical union of Dushyanta and Sakuntala tread the path of sorrow, and thereby chastened and sublimated it into a moral union.

Her long penances have purged her of the evil of her first union with Dyshyanta.

---

*It must not be forgotten that the hermitage of Kanva in the first Act is none the less heavenly—CKR.

The poet has shown here, as in *Kumara Sambhava,* that the beauty that goes hand in hand with Moral Law is eternal, that the calm, controlled, and beneficent form of Love is its best form, that beauty is truly charming under restraint and decays quickly when it gets wild and unfetteted, This anceint poet of India refuses to recognise Love as its own highest glory; he proclaims that Goodness is the final goal of Love. He teaches us that Love of man and woman is not beautiful, not lasting, not fruitful, so long as it is self-centred, so long as it does not beget Goodness, so long as it does not diffuse itself into society over son and daughter, guests and neighbours.

The beauty that he adores is lit up by grace, modesty, and goodness; in 'its intensity it is true to one for ever; in its range it embraces the whole universe. It is fulfilled by renunciation, gratified by sorrow and rendered eternal by religion.

Bharatiya Vidya Bhawan's Sri Sankaracharya [illegible] Vidyalaya ★
G31

Sri Ranga Printing Works, (Power Printers) Visakhapatnam.